THE BAPTIST AGAINST THE PAPIST:

OR,

The SCRIPTURE and *ROME* in Contention about the SUPREAM SEAT of JUDGMENT, in CONTROVERSIES of RELIGION.

Together with

Ten *Arguments* or *Reasons*, discovering the present Papal Church of *Rome*, to be no true Church of Christ.

WHEREIN

It is also evinced, That the present *Assemblies* of *Baptized Believers*, are the true Church of Jesus Christ.

By THO. GRANTHAM, a Prisoner for Truths sake.

Luke 16.29,31. *They have* Moses *and the Prophets, let them hear them.* —*If they hear not* Moses *and the Prophets, neither will they be perswaded though one should rise from the dead.*

Ezek. 20. 18,19. *But I said unto their children*— *Walk ye not in the Statutes of your fathers, &c.* —*I am the Lord your God, walk in my Statutes, and keep my Judgments, and do them* —

Joh. 12.48. *The Word that I have spoken, the same shall judge you in the last day.*

LONDON, Printed in the Year, 1663.

BODLEIANA · BIBLIOTHECA · BODLEIANA

THE AUTHOR TO THE READER.

Courteous Reader,

NOt *because I envy those of the Papal Church, or desire them any evil; Not that I desire they should be exposed to a suffering condition for matters of Religion, or that they should be denied any liberty in that respect which I desire my self, nor for any other prejudice (God knoweth) do I publish this small Treatise: But because I judge my self concerned at this time to give my Testimony for the Truth, against some Papal Tenents; for divers causes: As first,*

I am at this time under restraint, and though nothing hath been laid to my charge, yet it is rumour'd by some that I am a Papist; *yea, in this place of my Confinement, have I been told to my face by some of the Protestant Clergie, that I am a* Roman Jesuite. *And indeed this is an ordinary aspersion which hath been cast upon those in general to whom I am related upon a religious account, viz.* That we are all Papists, or will turn Papists, *&c. and this, not so much to our personal prejudice, as to the dishonour of that antient way of Truth by us professed. Secondly,*

A more particular occasion of the publication of this Treatise, proceeded from the Papists *themselves, in sending Seven* Queries *to the Baptized Congregations in this County (commonly called* Anabaptists*) To which, through the importunity of some Friends, I formed a brief Answer; little thinking, I confess, that so much contention would have risen thereupon, as since I have met with. And I likewise confess, that the undertaking is such, as that it requireth a more fit Instrument than my self to manage it.*

Nevertheless, I hope I may say, that hitherto what hath come to pass in this contest, hath fallen out rather to the furtherance of the Truth; for which cause I have thought fit to offer it to the perusal of others, so much of it I mean, as I conceive is at present needful; and that is the substance of what hath passed about the means whereby we must decide or resolve Controversies in Religion.

It

It now wants but few months of a year, since I sent my final Answer, containing a Review of all that had been said in way of Answer to the Queries *before, in which I produced the Testimony of divers Antient Doctors, as concurring with what I had therein spoken, and, as being directly opposite to my* Antagonist.

But I have heard of late, that he is gone out of this Nation, so that I expect no more Reply from him. And though for divers Reasons hereafter shewed, I have not published the whole Discourse (which, if need be, may in due time be brought to light) yet I have thought it meet here to set down all the Seven Queries, *that so if any Christian, of suitable endowments, for the Vindication of Truth, against the opposition that lyeth in the said* Queries, *shall think fit to lay forth his Talent in that Service, he may take hold of this occasion wherein to do it, (for the* Queries *were not directed to any particular person) however, I shall joyn to each* Query, *one* Antiquery, *which may serve at this present to blunt the edge of them, as they carry an opposition to the Truth.*

The QUERIES.

Query 1.

WHether we are to resolve all Differences in point of Religion, only out of the written Word of God?

Query 2.

How know you precisely what is the true Word of God?

Query 3.

How know you that your Copies and Translations of the Bible are the true Word of God? since the Original Writings are not come to your hands.

Query

The ANTI-QUERIES.

Antiq. 1.

WHat Differences in point of Religion can you resolve without the written Word of God? and whether the written Word of God be a perfect Rule for matters of Religion?

Antiq. 2.

Whether some Book must not of necessity speak for it self? and whether the Scripture doth not best deserve this priviledge? And whether it be not a bold presumption to say, there are no holy Books but them which we or you have received for such, sith those which we have, tell us, there are other holy Writings, which never yet came to our hands, nor to yours?

Antiq. 3.

What Copies and Translations of the Bible have you that are more true than ours? and where are the Original Manuscripts of the Prophets and Apostles?

Antiq.

Qu. 4.

Where we differ about the ſenſe of the Word, by whom muſt we be tryed? the dead Letter cannot explain it ſelf.

Antiq. 4.

When we differ about the true Church, and about the meaning of Authors, by whom muſt we be tryed? They cannot ſpeak for themſelves more than the Scripture: and whether the Scriptures, compared together, do not explain themſelves? alſo, whether it be not an opprobrious and ignominious ſpeech for you to call the Scripture a dead Letter? *and whether the true lovers of the Scripture ever vouchſafed it ſuch ill, and indeed improper language?*

Qu. 5.

What clear Text have you out of Scripture for the proceſſion of the holy Ghoſt from the Father & the Son? or, for changing the Sabbath from *Saturday* to *Sunday*? or prohibiting Poligamy, or Infant-Baptiſm? And whether there be not as clear Texts to prove unwritten Tradition, *Purgatory*, and the *real Preſence*?

Antiq. 5.

Whether the Baptiſm of the true Church be not one? and whether that one be not expreſly found in the Scripture? And whether the Scripture doth not prohibit all beſide that one? And whether the Papiſts have not confeſſed in many of their Books, that Infant-Baptiſm is not found in, nor grounded upon the Scripture? and then, whether it be not clear, that all the Texts which ſpeak of Baptiſm, do not prohibit Infant-Baptiſm? Alſo, whether Joh. 15.26. *and* 14.26. *and* 16.7. *be not clear Texts that the holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son? Alſo, whether* 1 Cor. 7. 1, 2, 3. *do not as much prohibit one man for having two Wives, and one woman for having two Husbands? and whether it do not clearly prohibit the latter? Alſo, whether there be any that hold the firſt day under the notion of a Sabbath among the Baptized Churches? and yet whether there be not clear Texts for the religious obſervation of it?* Act. 20.7. *Alſo, whether it be not abſurd for you to ask for clear Texts to prove unwritten things? Alſo, whether Purgatory, and the Real Preſence, as you hold them, is not plainly deſtructive to ſome Articles of the Chriſtian Faith?*

Qu. 6.

VVhether Universality both for time and place, be not an evident mark of the true Church?

Antiq. 6.

What Church can you name that hath that mark? And whether the Woman that John *saw, was not* Rome? *And whether her Cup was not universally received, so that all Nations were drunk thereby?*

Qu. 7.

Whether you have reaMy this mark, that is, whether you can fetch out of all Ages and Nations, Professors of your Religion; in particular, you are desired to name but one or two in the first six hundred years after Christ of your Profession; for example, such as held the sole-sufficiency of Scripture for deciding Controversies, and denied the lawfulness and usefulness of Infant-Baptism?

Antiq. 7.

Whether any man can shew this mark, as it is here call'd for, without the help of humane History? and whether humane History be a rule or ground for divine Faith? And whether humane Histories (especially those of the first three hundred) after Christ, were not most, if not all, burnt, which concerned the Church? and whether those that remain are not contradictory one to another? Also, whether Infant-Baptism was so much as heard of in the first hundred? and then, how could any be named that denied the usefulness thereof? Also, whether a Church, whose gathering, constitution and government is answerable to the Scripture, be not the true Church of Christ? And whether the Churches of the Baptists do not therein exceed all other whatsoever?

Thus, Reader, I have given thee some account of the causes why I publish this Treatise; I desire thee to peruse it diligently. If in any thing the Truth be dishonoured, through any Error maintained by me, (of which yet I do solemnly profess I am not conscious to my self) then do not forbear to blame me in a christian sort: only, if thou perceivest me deficient in point of Language and Method, I desire thee to bear with that; for I am one that gets my bread by the labour of my hands, and never saluted the Schools to gain the knowledge of their Arts.

From the Common-Goal in the Castle of *Lincoln*, the 10th of the 11 month, (commonly called *January*) 1662.

Farewel.

TO

TO THE
Nameless Author
OF THE
VII. QUERIES;
And in him, to all the SONS of
PAPAL ROME
In the County of *LINCOLN.*

HItherto *the things pertaining to Religion, as they concern the Baptized Congregations,* (*commonly called* Anabaptists) *and you that are commonly called* Papists, *have been very little controverted. And whether it shall ever please God to try his Peoples Faith and Stedfastness, by your open opposition, as he hath done it by others, I may not presume to determine; nor doubt I, but if it shall so fall out, he will advance his Truth thereby.*

It is most certain, that of those many wayes whereby the antient path of the Gospel hath for a long time been opposed, there is not found any more potent than yours; and the rather, because your subtilty is utterly unknown to the generality of Christians in this Age and Nation, where your Religion hath, as it were, lain dormant for many years.

The most dangerous stratagem wherewith you usually assail your opposits, is, your denyal of the Scripture, &c. the high doom of Judgment in matters of Faith; and ascribe that dignity to your selves, under pretence of your being the Church; wherein if you conquer any one, your work is, as it were, wholly accomplished.

Whereupon, I have here presented to the world, somewhat of your skill, in this important Question, Whether we are to resolve all Differences in point of Religion, only out of the written Word of God? *yea, I have faithfully transcribed your last Reply to my Answers, which contains the sum of what you said in all your other Papers. Whereby the Reader will discern (if I think right) wisdom used to the hurt of them that have received it. I have forborn at this time to publish all that hath passed*

between

between us about the ſeven Queries; *partly, for that one thing is oft repeated in our ſeveral Papers; and partly, and indeed eſpecially, for that it is to little purpoſe to controvert any particular point of Religion, till we be agreed about the Judge, that muſt determine our Differences. Now, whereas you aſcribe this Prerogative to your ſelves, under pretence of your being the Church of Chriſt, I have therefore laid down ſeveral Reaſons, by which it may appear, that you are not the Church, and ſo not that Judge, whereunto you pretend to be ſo willing to adhere.*

I have likewiſe ſhewed, that we, your oppoſits, have the true claim to the title of Chriſt's Church; that ſo, if you will appeal to her, you muſt then appeal to us; which yet we believe you will not be perſwaded to, nor indeed do we deſire you ſhould, whilſt this is the Queſtion, Whether we, or you, be the Church? *No, we are content to ſay with* Auguſtine, Ask not us in this caſe, we will not ask you, but let this matter be tryed by the Scripture: yea, *ſaith he,* let the Prophets, Chriſt, and his Apoſtles be Judge. *Yea, we ſay further in his words, Let matter with matter, cauſe with cauſe, reaſon with reaſon, counted by authority of the Scriptures, not proper to any but indifferent Witneſſes to both parts.*

Auguſt. *contra* Max. *l.* 3. *c.* 14.

My final Anſwer to the firſt of the ſeven Queries, *I have here publiſhed, with as little alteration or addition as poſſibly I could, to give the Reader a true underſtanding of the matters in difference. And if you publiſh any thing hereupon, I deſire no fairer dealing from you, than you have in this caſe from me.*

I have ſeriouſly conſidered what ſhould be the deſign of your Queries; *and hitherto it appears to be chiefly, to exalt the authority of mens Traditions, above the lively Oracles of God,* the Scriptures. *For though it ſhould be granted (which you can never prove) that there hath continued a true Church at* Rome *ever ſince it was there planted; yet would it not follow, that all which your Church holdeth under the title of* Eccleſiaſtical Tradition, *muſt needs be obeyed by us; for it is certain that the* Jews *did retain the ſtate of a true Church, when yet their Traditions (however by them accounted) were but the Traditions of men, which both the Prophets and Chriſt himſelf, termed* vain Worſhip; *eſpecially ſuch of them as made void the Commands of God, as we are ſure many of yours do: and therefore, as Chriſt ſaid to them,* Why do you tranſgreſs the Command of God by your Tradition? *the ſame we are humbly bold to ſay to you, when you ask us, why we tranſgreſs your Traditions? for ſurely, of none can it more fitly be ſaid than of you,* that laying aſide the Commandments of God, you hold the Tradition of men.

Mar. 7.

THO. GRANTHAM.

THE BAPTIST AGAINST THE PAPIST.

The FIRST PART ſheweth, the SCRIPTURE and ROME to be in Contention about the SUPREAM SEAT of JUDGMENT in Controverſies of RELIGION.

THE firſt of all Controverſies is founded upon this *Query: What is the authoritative Judge of Controverſies?* And indeed till there be ſome agreement in this point, there can be no expectation of any fruitful iſſue of any Controverſie.

Now all Controverſies amongſt the ſons of men, are reduceable to one of theſe two heads, namely, *things humane*, or, *things divine*; things preciſely pertaining to this life, or things which only pertain to that which is to come; concerns of a *ſecular conſideration*, or concerns of a *religious conſideration*. And according to the nature of theſe Controverſies, ſuch ought the Judge for deciſion thereof to be.

Concerning this Judge of *Religious Controverſies*, there are divers opinions. Some ſay that the *Light*, or that of God in *Every Man*, is this only infallible Judge of all Religious Controverſies. But if this be admitted, a multitude of inconveniences muſt needs follow, of which this is not the leaſt, That there can be no end of Controverſies, becauſe, if every man have this Judge of all Debates in himſelf, and he aver, that what he ſaith and doth is according to the voice of this Judge (or, *that of God in him*) no man can take in hand to judge contrary thereunto, without becoming the Judge's Judge,

and ſo violate the Rule propoſed. For this opinion refers not doubtful matters to that of God in ſome men, or a ſelect number of men, but to that of God in every man.

There is another Opinion, which ſaith, That amongſt all men which pretend to own Chriſt, and challenge to themſelves the title of his Church, and yet do deny each other to have an intereſt in that title; That amongſt all ſuch parties of the ſons of men, the only infallible and authoritative Judge of their *Controverſies about Religion*, is the LORD Himſelf, as he ſpeaketh by his Spirit in the holy Scriptures; together with *right Reaſon*: or thus, which is all one, The Apoſtles and Prophets, as they ſpeak *in* their holy Writings, are the onely infallible authoritative Judge in theſe Controverſies. Yet three things are in this Opinion allowed: firſt, That the living voice of the Paſtors (with the Church) in their reſpective Ages wherein they live, are of great importance in order to the terminating ſtrife in the Church, as a Church. Secondly, That Records of Antiquity are of ſome uſefulneſs for the reſolving ſome Controverſies, and for the better diſcovery of ſome Errors, yet not ſo abſolutely neceſſary, but that the Church may ſufficiently reſolve her Controverſies without them. Thirdly, That there is a Judgment of Science to be allowed every man, as touching all things which he chuſeth or refuſeth in matters of Religion, to be uſed with moderation and diſcreet ſubjection. And this is the Opinion to which for my part I do adhere.

There is another Opinion which ſaith, That the Papal Church of *Rome* is the Supream Judge and Catholick Moderatrix of all Diſputes in matters of Faith, and that *All* are bound to hear and obey her Voice under pain of Damnation; and that the Scriptures, as taken in the ſecond Opinion, is not the Judge of Controverſies. Now this is the Opinion which at this time I am to examine, which in much ſeriouſneſs I humbly purpoſe to do, and leave it to the ſober conſideration of all men.

And for the better diſcharge of this duty, it is meet we ſhould underſtand what the *Papiſts* mean by the Church of *Rome*. And this I find, that under that title they would involve the whole Church of Chriſt from the Apoſtles dayes until this preſent time, at leaſt all the Faithful ſince the time that *Paul* declares the *Roman* Church to have been famous, as *Rom.* 1. 8. But this is the very thing denied by us: for though we willingly grant that there was a very famous Church at *Rome*, when *Paul* wrote his Epiſtle to them; yet it followeth not, that there is ſuch a Church there now, or that all that

ever

ever from that time to this have walked in the ſteps of true Faith, muſt needs be ſuppoſed to have been Members of the *Roman Church*, or rather of the Church of *Rome* (ſo called) eſpecially ſince it was Papal. So that in this Controverſie they muſt be content to define the Church of *Rome* on this wiſe, (*viz.*) All that in any Age ſince Chriſt, was of the ſame Faith and Practice in things religious, which is at this day found in the Papal Church of *Rome*, and thoſe only, are the perſons of whom the Papal Church of *Rome* doth conſiſt. And indeed this is as much as they can reaſonably deſire; for if thoſe holy men who lived in times paſt, were of a Faith and Practice contradiſtinct to that which *Rome* hath now received, Then may not the preſent Papal Church without wrong, challenge them to be of their Church? As for example: *Paul*, who bore witneſs for Chriſt at *Rome*, and the Chriſtians there in his dayes, was of the Church of Chriſt at *Rome*; yet we deny that they were any part of the Papal Church of *Rome*.

The Church of *Rome* therefore, defined as before, I do deny to be the infallible authoritative Judge of all Controverſies about matters of Faith or Religion: And I do further ſay, That the Scriptures and right Reaſon, as laid down in the ſecond opinion, much more deſerves to be received for this ſupream Judge of Controverſies, than the Papal Church of *Rome:* and that there is not an other Umpire that can ſo effectually decide the Controverſies of Religion, which depend between ſuch parties of men as lay claim to the Title of Chriſt's Church, and yet deny each other to have an intereſt therein.

And how far forth the truth in this Point hath been evidenced in that *pro* and *con* Diſcourſe (ſo far as it relateth to the firſt of them) which hath been occaſioned by the writing of the *Seven Queries* I have before ſpoken of, is here offered to the Conſideration of all ſober men, that profeſs to own the Glorious Goſpel of the bleſſed God and our Saviour Jeſus Chriſt. The *firſt Query* of the *Seven* was this, propounded by the nameleſs Papiſt.

PAPIST.

Whether we are to reſolve all differences in point of Religion, only out of the written Word of God?

BAPTIST.

To which Queſtion theſe enſuing Anſwers were given before I received the Adverſaries laſt Paper, which, with the Anſwers thereunto,

unto, I will transcribe *verbatim*. I say the Answers were,

That the word *Controversies* being understood of such Controversies only as depend between those parties of men who deny each other to be the Church; that then there is no other way whereby *WE* can resolve those Controversies, but by the assistance of God's Spirit speaking to us [through the undoubted Prophets, and Apostles, and Primitive Churches] in the lively Oracles of God, the Scriptures of Truth, together with the help of right Reason in a way of subserviency to those divine directions. Or, if the word Controversies, shall relate only to all such Controversies as fall within the compass of the Church, that then to the former means, we are to joyn the living Voice and Authority of the Church (in present being) assembled with her Pastours, as the ordinary means appointed of God to terminate strife in the Churches. But if the Division in the Church be so great, as that it be not this way decisive; or the Doubt so secret, as not this way to be resolved; there is not then a better way, than for both Parties to reason it out till Truth and Innocency do prevail, as the two Tribes and an half did with the other Tribes of *Israel*, and prevailed, *Joshua* 22. or in some doubtful cases the use of Lots may be admitted for the resolution of them, *Acts* 1.

PAPIST.

It is worth observing, how many windings and turnings you have to avoid the difficulty of this Query; Whether we are to resolve all differences in point of Religion, only out of the written Word of God? *First, you leave out the word* [only] *in which lay the very knot of the difficulty.* 2. *Then you give me a piece of an Answer, and keep in* the living voice of the Church, *as a reserve for your Second Paper.* 3. *When you are shewed how you forsake your old fort,* the sole sufficiency of Scripture, *as if you were afraid to come too near us, you give back again, and do your worst to discredit this* living voice of the Church, *so that in effect it stands but for a meer cipher, as I foresaw it would when it came once to the scanning.* 4. *Upon second thoughts, finding your error, by putting the* Query, What is become of the living voice of the Church? *you shuffle again, and would gladly make something of it; but this something, in the end, falls to just nothing, as I shall make it further appear by ripping up the particulars of this your last Answer.*

BAPTIST.

I have used no windings to avoid the difficulty of the *first Query*; but you are to know, that when I first answered it, I took the word

Controversie

Controverſie, to relate only to ſuch Controverſies as depend between ſuch perſons as deny each other to have any preſent right to either the Name or Priviledges of the Church. And indeed, I do not ſee how any other ſenſe can be made of this *Query*: for, under that word *WE*, I ſuppoſe you included no more but your ſelf and Church, on the one party; and us, to whom you ſent the *Queries*, on the other party; and we well know that you account us no members of the Church; and you likewiſe know that we have the ſame opinion of you; but when your Obſervations (or Second Paper) took into the *Query* all Controverſies which fall within the compaſs of the Church, as ſuch, I could do no leſs than tell you, that my Anſwer did not exclude the *living voice of the Church* in ſuch caſes; [but that my Anſwer doth only exclude every ſuch voice as exalteth it ſelf above the Spirit ſpeaking in the Scriptures: And whereas in your Third Paper, you told me, That to appeal to Councils and Fathers, is a clear way to agree all our differences; I told you that this is a very cloudy way, and that becauſe they are contrary to themſelves, and one another. 2. Till they be agreed, they cannot agree us. 3. And ſith you take not the Scripture as being of any authority, till they, as the Church, give it you; I demanded, by what you would agree them in their diviſions? 4. And to ſhew you how they are divided, I gave you divers Inſtances concerning their diviſions, as alſo touching the corruption which hath been found in divers Popes.]

PAPIST.

1. *I had no reaſon to take notice of your excluding from the living voice of the Church*, every voice exalting it ſelf above the voice of Scripture, *becauſe it was a very needleſs Exception, ſince the Church arrogates no ſuch power, but only to interpret the voice of Scripture.*

2. *Why this way of taking the ſenſe of Scripture from the living voice of the Church, ſhould be ſo cloudy as you ſay it is, I do no more underſtand, than that the living voice of a Judge ſhould be a cloudy way to underſtand the Law by.*

As for your Riddles, how we are to reconcile the Fathers and Councils when they ſeem to claſh with their own Aſſertions, but by having recourſe to Scripture: I Anſwer briefly, That General Councils have no ſuch contradictions as you ſpeak of. And as for the holy Fathers, when there is any ſuch difficulty in any one of them, we muſt look upon the reſt what they ſay, and to follow their unanimous conſent: for if we take them ſingly, no doubt they have erred, and theſe errors we know by their diſſenting from the reſt; for otherwiſe, certainly the authority of any one of the

antient

antient Fathers, when he expounds Scripture, or relates the Chriſtian practice of his time, and is not cenſured or contradicted by the reſt, or condemned by the Church in a General Council, is of greater authority to decide Controverſies in point of Religion, or to know the true meaning of Scripture, than any thing you have alledged, as we ſhall ſee by and by, when I have firſt examined what you bring to diſcredit the Fathers and Councils.

Againſt the Fathers, you firſt bring St. Aug. retract. 21. *contradicting himſelf by ſaying, that,* Matth. 16. *Chriſt built not his Church upon* Peter, *but upon* Peter's *Faith: ſure you read not St.* Aug. *for he there expounds that place of Chriſt himſelf, and not of the Faith of St.* Peter; *nor doth he recal his expounding it elſewhere of St.* Peter, *but leaves both Expoſitions as probable, concluding thus;* Hunc autem ſententiam quæ ſit probalitur eligat lector. *Is this fair dealing? Again, you bring in St.* Aug. contra. Petil. c. 2, 3, 4. *as contrary to himſelf and me, beeauſe he teaches, That the Church is to be found out by the words of Chriſt. But though (I doubt) you cannot make this appear in any of theſe three Chapters, yet were it nothing to the purpoſe; for we deny not but the Church is to be found out by theſe clear marks, whereby the holy Scripture hath deciphered her.*

Next, you alledge St. Chryſoſt. *in* Pſal. 22. *and St.* Ambroſe de Sacrament. *calling the Bleſſed Sacrament, a ſimilitude or figure of Chriſt's Body and Blood. I Anſwer.* 1. *That it is the Opinion of the Learned, that neither St.* Chryſoſt. *nor indeed any Grecian, could be Author of that work.* 2. *I ſay, the Sacrament may be truly called the ſimilitude of Chriſt's Body and Blood, becauſe it is not given in the form of fleſh and blood, of which men would have a horror, as the ſame St.* Amb. *obſerves, but under the Forms of Bread and Wine.*

The next is St. Dinis Eccl. Herarch. *but quoting no place, I have not yet met with it; I am ſure that work is ſo clearly for us in this very point, that our Adverſaries the* Calviniſts, *and* Calvin, *denies it to be his: St.* Aug. *and* Tertull. *are as clear for us, and what you bring out of them clearly anſwered by* Bellarm. de Euchar. *And you are to know that it is a general rule amongſt the Learned, that we are to explicate obſcure places by thoſe that are clear, if we mean to know the Opinion of any Author, it being impoſſible for any man to write ſo warily, but that ſomething may be objected out of him (eſpecially if he have writ much, as it is our caſe) which may ſeem contrary to what he expreſly teaches. And you had need obſerve this rule in expounding the Scriptures themſelves, or otherwiſe you will meet with a thouſand abſurdities and contradictions.*

Againſt

Againſt the Councils you produce that of Conſtantinople *under* Conſtant. Copron. *as crying down Tranſubſtantiation. But this was a factious Meeting, never owned for a Council, neither by the Greek nor Latine Fathers, and expreſly condemned in the* Nicene *Council: and the jeſt is, this Mock-Council was ſo far from condemning Tranſubſtantiation as you affirm, that they ſwore by the Body and Blood of Chriſt in the Euchariſt, to aboliſh the Worſhip of Images:* [Something ſhould here have been ſaid concerning *Bertram*, who is ſaid to have oppoſed Tranſubſtantiation; but in the tranſcription of my Third Paper, there was an *Errata*, and the Inſtance is not material; ſo that what is ſaid about him, I will expunge in both Papers.]

You ſay further againſt the Authority of Councils, That they have contradicted each other in their Decrees, about the Laityes communicating in one or both kinds: But we grant that the Church may vary in Cuſtoms of this nature, which being indifferent, may be altered as ſhe ſhall think fit, according to ſeveral circumſtances: What we deny is, that the Church, or General Councils ever made contrary Decrees about the belief of any point of Faith.

It is no wonder that you have a fling againſt the Pope, after you have been ſo bold with Holy Fathers, and General Councils; but I muſt tell you, Though many of our Divines hold him infallible, when he ſpeaks ex Cathedra, *as they call it, yet is it not the Opinion of all, and conſequently no Article of our Faith. Only we agree in this, That for preſerving peace in the Church, all are bound ſo far to ſubmit to the Popes Decrees, as not to oppoſe them until a General Council be called, from whoſe Judgment we admit no Appeal. What you ſay of the wicked Lives of ſome of them, is nothing to the purpoſe; for as wicked* Caiphas *play'd the Prophet, ſo might the Biſhops of* Rome, *with the aſſiſtance of the Holy Ghoſt, be true interpreters of God's Word, for all their wicked lives; ſuch* Gratia gratis date, *which are given for the good of others, do not argue his Sanctity that hath them.*

To make you a true Prophet, I will here cry out, What is become of the living voice of the Church, ſince you have done what you can to diſcredit her, by caſting all the dirt you can in her face, as it is evident, unleſs you will throw out the Holy Fathers and General Councils (the Churches Repreſentatives) out of the Church!

BAPTIST.

I perceive our Judgments differ concerning *the living voice of the Church*, what it is? I have told you, That I take it for the preſent Church and her Paſtours, in thoſe particular Ages wherein they

live. You take this *living voice* to be the Decrees of Councils, and Books of the antient Fathers. And here I cannot but marvel, why you ſhould be willing to Appeal *to* the Books of the Antients, and their written Decrees, as *a living voice*, and *clear way* to decide our Controverſies, and yet appeal *from* the Books of the Prophets and Apoſtles, as being *but dead Letters, and ſenceleſs Characters*. Certainly, if any Writings now extant, may be called *the Churches living voice*, the Holy Scripture doth better deſerve that title than any other. Nor will it ſuffice here to object (as it is the Papiſts uſual way) that our difference is about the Scripture and the Senſe thereof, *&c.* for the ſame difference is found amongſt us, touching the Books and Senſe of Councils and Fathers: yea, I think I may be bold to ſay, That even the Learned are ſo much divided concerning them in both reſpects, as that they can never be therein reconciled.

But is it ſo? that the voice of the Fathers, *&c.* who only ſpeak in their Writings, is a means or way of equal clearing to decide our differences, as the voice of a living Judge in a Caſe of Law amongſt men? Then what reaſonable man can render a reaſon, that the voices of the Prophets and Apoſtles, though only ſpeaking to us in their Books and Decrees, may not be appealed to, as a clear way to decide our differences? Sith all men, profeſſing Chriſtianity, muſt confeſs that the Prophets and Apoſtles ſpeak with as much Life and Power, Certainty and Authority, as any that ever writ ſince their time: Nowhither now can you turn your ſelves, but to your ſelves (as I have formerly noted) and take upon you to be the *only* living voice, that muſt, without controul, interpret Fathers, Councils, and Scriptures too; and when you have done, ſit down as Judge, to give Sentence for your ſelves, and againſt your oppoſers.

Well, you have aſſigned us a Judge of Controverſies; To wit, the Fathers and Councils of the Church (long ago deceaſed) and this is a clear way, you ſay, to agree all. But I have noted that it's a very cloudy way, and that becauſe they could not yet agree themſelves; for they are oppoſite each to other to this day, inſomuch as you are utterly unable to reconcile them, ſince (as I have ſhewed) you muſt not make uſe of the Scripture to that purpoſe; becauſe, before the Scripture can have any authority to any purpoſe, (according to your Judgment) your Councils muſt deliver it to us as the Word of God; which they cannot do till they be found, Firſt, holy Fathers and Councils of the Church; And ſecondly, at unity among themſelves, and each with himſelf. And I have asked you, How you will effect this difficult work? To which you Anſwer; Firſt,

That

That General Councils have no ſuch Controverſies as I talk of. Secondly, *That when there is ſuch difficulty in any one of the Fathers, we muſt look upon the reſt what they ſay, and ſo follow their unanimous conſent; for* (ſay you) *if we take them ſingly, no doubt they have erred, and theſe errors we know by their diſſenting from the reſt.*

I anſwer firſt, That General Councils have erred, and that in matters of Faith, is undeniable, if Records may be credited rather than you. As firſt, The Council of *Arimi.* did err ſo, as to conclude for the *Arrian* Hereſie, namely, That there was a time when Chriſt was not the Son of God: and ſure you account that an errour in point of Faith. Secondly, The Council of *Epheſus* did err ſo, as to conclude for the *Eutichian* Hereſie, namely, That the Body of Chriſt was not of one Subſtance with ours; and is not this an errour in point of Faith? Or will you ſay, that theſe things were never contradicted and cenſured by other Councils? Theſe things are not denied by your eminent Diſputant. See the Book intituled, *Certamen Religioſum.* So then it appears, that General Councils have erred, and contradicted each another in very high points of Faith.

Theſe were both General Councils

Moreover, as to the things whereof I chiefly ſpake in my laſt Paper, it is manifeſt that Councils have contradicted one another about the Sacraments; for the Council of *Conſtance*, confirmed by Pope *Martin the Fifth*, doth curſe the Laity, or excommunicate ſuch as receive the Sacrament in both kinds. And yet by the Council of *Baſil*, the Laity are allowed to receive it in both; which Council was alſo confirmed by a Pope, namely, *Felix the Fifth.* Sure one of theſe Councils muſt needs err. But you have a way to ſalve this errour (ſuch as it is) and that is to tell me, *That the Church may vary in cuſtoms of this nature.* Sure this is a corrupt opinion, by which it will follow, That we have no certainty of, nor conſtancy in any Ordinance of Chriſt; for if the Church have power to take the Cup away, ſhe hath power alſo to take the Bread away; for certainly ſhe hath as much to do with the one, as the other. But truly this your variation, as it is clear beſide the Inſtitution of Chriſt, and the Doctrine of *Paul*, ſo it hath in a manner deſtroyed both Baptiſm, and the Supper of the Lord, as is evident by the practice uſed in divers of your *Maſſes*, where the People partake neither of the Bread nor Cup. As alſo your *Peda-Rantiſm*, hath in a great meaſure defrauded the Sons of men of the Baptiſm of Repentance.

Mat.26
1Cor.11

But be pleaſed to conſider, that this your ſacrilegious diviſion of this Sacrament, is condemned by *Cyprian*, *Gelaſius*, and others. Firſt, *Cyprian*

Cyprian Serm. Penet.

Cyprian saith, *How can we exhort the People to shed their blood for Christ, if we deny them the Blood of him?*

Gelas. consec. Dist. 2. *The division of this Mystery cannot be without great Sacriledge,* saith *Gelasius.*

Again, you cannot be ignorant how the Council of *Carthage*, decreed the Books of *Tobit*, *Judith*, *Ecclesiasticus*, *Sapience*, and *Maccabees*, should be received for Canonical, notwithstanding they were rejected out of the sacred Canon by the Council of *Laodicea*; and here by the way I may take notice, how you would have me walk by such a rule as you your self do not observe; for you propose the Judgment of those who lived neareſt to the Apostles times, as my safest rule to walk by, supposing they knew the Mind of God, or Christ, better than those that came after; but then why do you reject the Judgment of the *Laodicean* Council, which is more antient than that of *Carthage*, which yet you follow in receiving the Books of *Maccabees* into your Canon of holy Scripture.

Secondly, It is marvellous to see, what work you make in reconciling the Fathers without the Scriptures. And seeing you are so hardy as to undertake this task without Scripture, as undoubtedly you see you must, or else grant, that the Scripture must be that whereby we must decide all Controversies in Religion; for certainly, if we must decide all the Fathers Controversies in Religion with or by the Scripture, it is not then very likely that either we or they should decide ours without them: but I say, sith you have undertaken to decide the Fathers Differences without Scripture, pray tell me, before you meddle with their Differences, how you know them to be holy Fathers of the Church? can you prove them Church-members without Scripture? I believe this is as hard a task as to reconcile their Differences without Scripture; and yet this also must you do, before you can look upon the Scripture as any Rule for either them, or your self.

You tell me, if I take the Fathers singly, no doubt they have erred: yet you say I must follow their unanimous Consent, (a pretty Paradox) Follow their Consent! in what? why say you, in their Interpretation of Scripture. Of Scripture! Why there is no such thing as yet for them to interpret; for you know (that by your own direction) we have laid by the Scripture, and must reconcile these Fathers by themselves. Miserable Guide! hast thou not led me into a Labyrinth, and run thy self into a sufficient Maze? I'le back again and see how these Fathers themselves direct me in this difficult point. And first I meet with famous *Augustine*, who tels me how he took notice

notice of the Fathers that were before him. Saith he,

My conſent without exception I owe not to any Father, were he never ſo well learned, but only to the Canonical Scripture: For whereas the Lord hath not ſpoken, who of us can ſay it is this or that? and if he do ſay ſo, how can he prove it? Yea, ſaith he, *I require the voice of the Shepherd reade me this matter out of the Prophets, Pſalms, the Goſpel, or the Apoſtles Epiſtles.* Neither (ſaith he) *ought we to take the diſpenſations* OF ALL MEN, *how* CATHOLICK SOEVER *they be, or be they never ſo commendable as* we take *the canonical Scriptures, as though we may not (ſaving the honour that's due to ſuch men) reprove or refuſe any thing of their Writings, if we find they meant otherwiſe than the Verity doth allow, by the help of God found by us, or by others.* Aſ. de Nat. & Grat. Aug. in Iohn. Tract. 94.

Again, he ſaith, *I am not moved with* Cyprian's *Epiſtles; for I do not take the Letters of* Cyp. *as the Canonical Scripture, but I do try his Writings* BY THE CANONICAL SCRIPTURE; *and whatſoever in them doth agree with the Authority of the holy Scripture, I do receive it with his Commendation; and whatſoever doth not —— I do by his good leave refuſe it.* Aug. ad Fortunat.

And for further teſtimony of *Auguſtine*'s integrity, hear what he ſaith of himſelf: *Truſt not me,* (ſaith he) *nor credit my Writings, as if they were Canonical Scripture, but whatſoever* THOU *findeſt in the Word, although thou didſt not believe it before, yet ground thy Faith on it now; and whatſoever thou readeſt of mine, unleſs thou know it certainly to be true, give no certain aſſent unto it.* Again, he thus teacheth, *We muſt be partakers of other mens Writings, wholly after the manner of Bees; for they flie not alike to all Flowers, nor where they ſit do they ſnatch all quite away, but ſnatching ſo much as may ſerve to their honey-making, they take their leave of the reſt. Even ſo we, if we be wiſe, having gotten ſo much of others as is ſound and agreeable to Truth, we will leap over the reſt. Which rule, if we keep in reading and alledging the Fathers words, we ſhall not ſwerve from our Profeſſion, the Scriptures ſhall have the ſovereign place, and yet the Doctors of the Church ſhall loſe no part of their due eſtimation.* Auguſt. Prolog. l. 3. de Trin.

And ſaith *Origen, We have need to bring the Scriptures for witneſs, for our Meanings and Expoſitions without them, have no credit,—— the diſcuſſing of our Judgements muſt be taken* ONLY *of the Scriptures.* Orig. in Jer. hom. 1.

Thus you ſee the Fathers were not of your mind, that the Readers of their Books ſhould not try them by the Scripture, but the contrary; and that as we find them conſenting to, or diſſenting from Scripture (not one another as you teach) accordingly they adviſe us to believe, or not believe them.

As

As I have ſaid, it is a cloudy way to appeal to Councils and Fathers, ſo you now prove my ſaying true: for I alledged *Auguſtine*, as being oppoſite to you and your Church, touching the meaning of *Matth.* 16. *Upon this Rock*, &c. and, firſt, you tell me I read him not; but I muſt tell you, I read him after a Scholar ſufficient: and though your reading differ ſomething from his, yet they both deſtroy the received Opinion of your Church concerning that Text; for if Chriſt be that Rock, as you confeſs *Auguſtine* there teacheth, then it cannot be meant poſitively of *Peter*, and ſo not conſequently of your Popes.

My quotation out of *Chryſoſtom* in *Pſ.* 22. you invalidate, by telling me, that Book was not writ by him. And this I find to be the uſual way of Learned-men, when the paſſage alledged is clear and convincing, then a ſuſpition muſt be caſt upon the Book, &c. I could inſtance the beſt part of a thouſand Books, Epiſtles, &c. which are intituled under the names of the Antient Fathers; amongſt which, as you obſerve, is reckoned the Book of *Dynis* the Areopagite, which I alledged in my Rejoynder. And do not theſe things contribute ſomething towards the proof of my Aſſertion, namely, That it is a cloudy way to appeal to Fathers and Councils to decide Controverſies in Religion. If then your way be cloudy, mine muſt needs be clear, unleſs you can aſſign a third way, oppoſit to both; for undoubtedly there is a clear way to decide Controverſies.

You again preſcribe me a way to find the meaning of the Fathers, and that is, to *explicate their obſcure places by ſuch as are plain*, &c. But by your leave, we can neither know which of their ſpeeches are obſcure or plain, without ſome rule whereby to know this. And now, what can ſupply this our neceſſitiy? For example, *Auguſtine* is ſometimes read, affirming the Sacrament to be the real Body and Blood of Chriſt; otherwhiles he is read directly oppoſit to this: And how can you, or any body elſe, tell which of theſe ſayings is clear or obſcure, ſith none muſt be permitted the uſe of his reaſon (by you) in this Controverſie; and how he ſhould judge according to Faith, I know not, ſith you, as yet, debar us of that by which Faith NOW cometh, namely, the Doctrine of the Prophets and Apoſtles as contained in the Scriptures.

PAPIST.

Something you would ſay for this living Voice of the Church *you once had required as neceſſary to reſolve Differences in Religion, but this ſignifies nothing in our preſent* Query: *for, after all your ſhifting, I cannot perceive*

perceive that you make use of her Authority in point of Faith, (which is our Qu.) but only to take up other quarrels, by exhorting, reproving, &c. and in this also it seems you will be your own Judge, whether she follow Christ or no.

Three things you affirm in relation to the Churches Authority. 1. That she is to rule her self according to Scripture; which no body denies. 2. That the Church in former Ages is not to be a Rule for after Ages to rule themselves by; because she could not foresee the Controversies that rise up afterwards. What if the same Errors be revived now, which in their times were condemned, is not the Judgment of the Church in those dayes a safe President for us to condemn the same Errors? Besides, Is it not evident that the Pastors of the Church, the nearer they were to Christ's time, were the better able to judge of Christ's Doctrine? You say, 3dly. That the Church is to be no Rule for those that are out of her communion. A strange Assertion. As if a clear light (as the Church is in holy Scripture) with so many marks to know her by; as Unity, Sanctity, Universality, Miracles, &c. were not a good means for him that gropes in the dark to find out his way. Look well upon these marks, and you will find them to agree Only to the Roman Catholick Church, and to no upstart Congregation, and consequently, that you ought in all reason to give her the hearing in matters of Faith, and to have recourse unto her, as to the pillar and ground of Truth, 1 Tim. 3. which place you let slip, and this under pain of being accounted a Heathen, &c. Matth. 18. for though this place doth point out chiefly the obedience which Members of the Church owe her in point of Discipline, as you say well enough, yet hath it no small force in our present Debate, since those that will not hear her Voice when she ecchoes out the Voice of God, may well be esteemed by her as a Heathen. And in your own sence I suppose you will have your proviso, That the Church is to be obeyed only when she ruleth according to God's Word, of which you will be Judge too: So in conclusion all comes to this, That you and your spirit must be Judge of all Disputes. And then have not I reason to ask again (since I, or any body else, may challenge as large a share in the Spirit and right Reason as you) who shall take up the Quarrel? And is not my comparison here very pat, That there must needs be as great confusion in your Church, as in a Kingdom where every one were left to decide his own case? This was not the old way, as you may see, Deut. 17. 8, 9. and Malach. 2. 7. which places you had no mind to take notice of: and yet you charge me for letting pass your Instance of St. Stephen, concerning the Libertines, Alexandrians, &c. which makes nothing at all for your pretended Evidence of God's Word: For though his Judgment might be well taken in expounding Scripture, as being full of the holy Ghost, and confirming what he said by Miracles,

racles, as the Scripture tells us he did, yet this is not your case, for I think you will not arrogate so much to your self.

What you say of Christ and his Apostles vindicating their Doctrine out of Scripture, is very true, and our Church doth the same: but it is not true, that either Christ, or the primitive Saints were alwayes wont to send their Proselytes to the Scripture, to regulate their Faith. Did not Christ himself send St. Paul *to* Ananias *for instruction? Had you been of his counsel, you would have rather wished him to look into the Word of God, and see there what he was to do. And when there arose a Debate, even in the Apostles dayes, about the necessity of Circumcision,* Act. 15. *did they not assemble the Church, and so pronounce Sentence* conciliariter, *with a* visum est Spiritui sancto & nobis ?

BAPTIST.

[It is here worth noting how you dispute beyond the due bounds of the *Query*, which, as it concerns you *Papists* and us *Baptists*, hath no relation to the Differences which arise in the Church, as such, and indeed you go amiss in this matter throughout the whole Discourse.]

Here you seem to acknowledge, *that the Church ought to rule according to Scripture*; but you will not allow me to judge whether she do so or not. But I answer, that there is a Judgment of *Science*, as well as a Judgment *Authoritative*; the latter I know cannot be exercised by me, nor any other Member of the Church, because this Power lyeth in the Church as imbodied together; but the former, to wit, a Judgment of Science or Knowledge, is particular to each individual, and so my self, if a Member of the Church, am allowed the exercise thereof, even in matters of Religion, 1 *Cor.* 10. 15. *I speak to wise men: judge ye what I say.* The Apostle doth not here give any wise man at *Corinth* leave to judge of that which he said, so as to censure what he had delivered, yet he must exercise his understanding to judge of what *Paul* had said, thereby to find out the verity of what was spoken. But yet I do confess, that our case, and the case of Christians then, do differ: for *Paul* was a Foundation-layer, a Master-builder, (so that the Members might not so well judge then, as now, yet) the Church now is to build upon the Foundation which is laid already: and you know that I have in my Rejoynder acknowledged, that it very nearly concerns particular Members of the Church, to have great regard to the Judgment of the Church, when, after serious debate, they deliver their Sentence in any point disputable. And further (as touching your Church) you tell me anon, that even a Heathen may judge of the

the *holineſs* of your Church, by the Law of Conſcience; and then, why may he not by the ſame Law judge your Church concerning her *unholineſs?* nay verily, he muſt be able to ſpeak both wayes, or elſe he hath no Judgment. And if a Heathen have this priviledge and ability, then why not a man profeſſing Chriſtianity, who hath not only the Conſcience-Law, but alſo the written Law of God, by which he underſtands things more excellent, *Rom.* 2. From all this I only conclude, that each particular ought to have the free exerciſe of his Judgment in what he chuſeth or refuſeth, ſith without this he cannot chuſe or refuſe any thing with confidence, nor to his comfort.

And concerning Controverſies in the Church, I do not ſee that (in theſe dayes) we are bound to follow the ſentence of a multitude, (though aſſembled in Council) SO, as to hold their Sentence abſolutely infallible; for the promiſe of infallibility is not made to a certain ſelect number * of Biſhops, but to the Church, taken collectively; and we may remember that a great Aſſembly of Prophets in the old Church, erred in Judgment with unanimous conſent, when yet the Lord had one *Micaiah* at home which underſtood the truth of his Will. Wherefore I here conclude, although the Members of the Church ought to weigh with great reſpect the things concluded of by their Paſtors, yet ſo may it be that they may ſwerve from the Truth, whilſt God clears it up by ſome particular rather than by ſuch an Aſſembly. And to this agrees very well a ſaying of *Gerſon*, *If it ſhould ſo happen that there ſhould be a General Council aſſembled, in which ſuch a man were preſent as is well inſtructed, If the greateſt part ſhould decline through Malice or IGNORANCE, to the oppoſition of the Goſpel, ſuch a LAY-Man may be objected, againſt the ſaid General Council.* And ſaith *Panormitan*, *In matters WHICH CONCERN FAITH, the ſaying of a LAY-Man ought to be preferred before that of the Pope, if his ſaying be more probable by better authority of Scripture than that of the Pope.*

* *The Apoſtles are here excepted*

Gerſon exam. of Doct.

Panor. chap. ſignif.

You often tell me, that to appeal to the Spirit ſpeaking in the Scriptures, &c. is not a ſufficient way to decide OUR Controverſies, and that becauſe you may challenge them to be for you, &c. To which I anſwer, by retorting your Argument thus, That which you call *the living Voice of the Church*, to wit, Volumns of Fathers, and Decrees of Councils, is therefore inſufficient to decide OUR Controverſies, becauſe your oppoſites do ſay they are for them, and againſt you: and now you muſt anſwer your own *Query*, viz. *Who muſt take up this Quarrel?* You anſwer, that we muſt *explicate them one by another; the places which are obſcure, by ſuch as are plain.* And

then I ſtill ask you, why we may not as well agree our ſelves this way by the Volumns of the Prophets and Apoſtles?

I ſhewed before, how you miſapply that Text, *Matth.* 18. and though the caſe is ſo plain, as that you cannot defend your ſelf, yet you ſeem loth to decline your error, and would faſten a very groſs paſſage upon me; namely, that I ſhould ſay, That the Church is *no Rule for thoſe that are out of her Communion, as not to be a light for ſuch as grope in the dark.* A manifeſt wrong; I only ſay and prove, That thoſe that are not of the Church, are not within the power of her Diſcipline; nor can ſhe reaſonably deſire unconverted ones to appeal to her Judgment-ſeat in Controverſies between them and her. And I asked you, If you would not ſcorn us, if we ſhould call upon you to appeal unto us as your Judges, *Whether we, or you, be the Church?* and not doubting but you would, I concluded, that it is equally abſurd for you, to deſire us to appeal to you as our Judges. But you may find it plain enough in my Papers, That I do believe the Church *SO* to be a Rule to the world, as to ſhew them the way of Life, and ſo a good means for their Illumination and Converſion. ——

As for your three Texts, 1 *Tim.* 3. *Deut.* 17. 8, 9. *Malachi* 2. 7. As they do your cauſe no good, ſo they do mine no harm: I grant the Church is the pillar and ground of the Truth, and that ſhe hath Power to hear and determine all Controverſies among her Members, as aforeſaid; and that it is the duty of the Members, to enquire of their Paſtors, what is the way of God concerning them: But what of all this? *Ergo*, The Papal Church of *Rome* is the only infallible Judge, and Moderatrix of all Contention about Religion. *Ergo*, we muſt all appeal to the Papal Church of *Rome*, as our Judge, in this Queſtion, *Whether we be of the Church, or not?* though we be in doubt, Whether ſhe her ſelf be a true Church, or not? yea, though we are ſatisfied ſhe is not. Are not theſe *Monſtrous* Conſequences?

Be it here obſerved, That I do believe the Church of Chriſt to be the Pillar of Truth, *ſo*, as that ſhe was never ſo over-clouded with error, but that ſhe hath enjoyed the fruition of that Promiſe, *Matth.* 16. in ſome good meaſure ever ſince it was made: Nor ſhall ſhe ever *ſo* cloſe with the gates of Hell, as by general conſent, and full authority to diſſert that Faith, which having Chriſt for its object, is the Rock ſhe is built upon: and therefore you ſee, I hold the Church cannot err (in ſome ſenſe) and indeed, he that holds the contrary, muſt (for ought I ſee) raze out that Promiſe, *Matth.* 16.

and

and many other. And yet nothing from all this accrues to the Papal Church of *Rome*.

I alledged *Stephen*, as defending the Truth by the authority of Scripture *Only*, *&c.* Nor can it be groundedly imagined, that (had it been the mind of God, *that ſuch as are not of the Church*, ſhould be ſummoned to her Tribunal) *Stephen* (being full of the holy Spirit, the leader into all truth) would have omitted the uſe of that means, but he knew that ſuch authority the Church had none, as I ſhewed from 1 *Cor.* 5. *What have I to do to judge them that are without? do not ye alſo judge them that are within?* And therefore he could not mention any ſuch power. And though *Stephen* did many wonders among the People, yet at this time when he ſo powerfully vanquiſhed his adverſaries, he did none at all, but only overcame them by the aſſiſtance of the Spirit ſpeaking in the Scripture, *&c.* I deſired you to ſhew me *but one* Inſtance, where ever any of the Primitive Saints did appeal to the Church, of which they were preſent Members, as Judge between them and ſuch as never received their Doctrine: but you have not done it, nor indeed can it be done. As I ſhewed, that *Stephen* appealed to Scripture *ONLY*, *&c.* ſo I alſo ſhewed, That it was the way of Chriſt and his Apoſtles, frequently to vindicate their Doctrine *againſt ſuch as were not of their Church*, by appealing to the Scriptue (eſpecially amongſt ſuch as owned the Scripture) this you confeſs; and alſo you tell me, that your Church doth the ſame: But this cannot be true of *All* your Doctrine, becauſe you have told me, That *many Points of your Faith are reſolved without the written Word of God*; or elſe you never anſwered my firſt *Antiquery*, which demandeth, What Controverſie in Religion you can reſolve without the written Word of God? And in your Anſwer you aſſigned, The Proceſſion of the Holy Ghoſt from the Father and the Son, Sabbath, Infant-Baptiſm, and MANY OTHER POINTS OF FAITH; and I ſhall ſhew anon, that we have it *pro confeſſo*, from your Champions, that there be ſome Points of your Faith, which is not GROUNDED UPON, nor MENTIONED IN the SCRIPTURES; and therefore your Church cannot vindicate ſuch Points of her Faith and Doctrine by the Scripture.

Although Chriſt ſent *Paul* to *Ananias* for inſtruction, yet it followeth not, that we muſt take *Romes* inſtructions without Scripture. Is there no difference between the time that now is, and then was? Much of the Scripture (if not all the New Teſtament) was then unwritten. Again, *Ananias* was immediatly ſent of God. If you

are *ſo* ſent, prove it to us, as *Ananias* did, by ſhewing the Miracle of reſtoring *Paul*'s ſight. If you are not *ſo* ſent, to what purpoſe do you alledge this Text? I believe I might form you a *monſtrous Conſequence* here.

PAPIST.

You that will not truſt the Churches Judgment, lay down four wayes of reſolving Doubts; The firſt, To argue it out till Truth prevail. *But if we muſt argue only out of Scripture, and be our own Interpreters of it, there can be no end of arguing, as I have often ſhewed. The ſecond,* To appeal to God as the two Tribes did, *Joſh.*22. *A rare way to end Controverſies, to look for Miracles in our Diſputes. The third,* To appeal to Scripture, and right Reaſon: *But if I challenge them to be on my ſide, who muſt take up the difference? The fourth,* To caſt Lots. *But though the Apoſtles did it, who certainly were inſpired to do ſo, yet muſt not we preſume to tempt God, or to look for the like Miracles, or to build our Faith upon ſuch doubtful events.*

BAPTIST.

You here wrong us, to ſay, that we will not truſt the Judgment of the Church; for the Church, truly and univerſally taken, we do credit, as her that is appointed of the Father, to be the Pillar and Ground of the Truth; of which Church, we take the Prophets and Apoſtles to be the principal Members, and ſo in all Points of Faith, to be credited in the firſt place. But if by Church, you mean the Papal Church of *Rome*, I confeſs we dare not truſt her Judgement, at leaſt, not in all that ſhe ſaith; for example in theſe following: 1. Your Church tells us, That it is not needful for the Scriptures to be read to, or by the Laity, in a tongue which they underſtand: and that though they Pray (after another) in Latine, though they underſtand not what they ſay, yet ſuch prayer is ſufficient, *Rhem. Teſt. Annot. in* 1 *Corinthians.* 2. Your Church tells us, That the Sacrifice of your Maſſe, is available to take away, or obtain remiſſion of ſins by the work wrought. *Con. Trident. Seſs.* 22. That the whole Maſſe is a propitiatory Sacrifice for the quick and dead; and whoſo ſaith, it is only a commemoration of Chriſt's Death, *&c.* is accurſed. *Con. Trent.* 3. Your Church holds, That ſuch as deny that the real Fleſh and Blood of Chriſt, is in the Bread and Wine of the Sacrament, ought to be burnt to death. 4. Your Church holds, and tells us, That Images, and old clothes of Saints, ought to be worſhipped with religious Worſhip. 5. That men are AS FULLY Juſtified by good Works, AS THEY ARE DAMNED BY

evil

× things

evil Works. 6. That it is unlawful for Miniſters of Chriſt to Marry. 7. That the Scripture doth not contain all things neceſſary to Salvation. To omit many other, theſe are Points of your Churches Judgment, which we dare not truſt, till by you, or ſome other, proved to be Truths.

I aſſigned the uſe of Lots as lawful in ſome doubtful caſes to end Controverſies, and for proof, I quoted *Acts 7.* and this you will not allow for two Reaſons. 1. Becauſe (you ſay) the Apoſtles were inſpired to uſe them; but were it ſo (as that you cannot prove) yet it cannot be denied, but we may do ſome things which they were inſpired to do: for the Holy Ghoſt was to lead them into all Truth, and they were to lead us into the ſame Truth, by their Example and Doctrine, *Joh.* 16. 13. 1 *Cor.* 11. 1, 2. And be it here obſerved, That the Holy Ghoſt led thoſe, our Teachers, to ordain the Miniſtry by Prayer, and laying on of Hands, *Acts 6* and *Acts 13.* which practice of theirs, is a good preſident to act by; a preſident I ſay; for this practice is not expreſly commanded in Scripture, no more than the uſe of Lots in the election of Miniſters. If it here be objected, That Chriſt might give *laying on of hands* in Precept when he was with his Apoſtles. I Anſwer, So alſo might he give them the other to be uſed, when there might be perſons found of ſeemingly equal fitneſs to ſerve the Church. 2. You reckon the uſe of Lots, *Acts* 1. amongſt Miracles, as your other Reaſon, why we may not uſe them to decide any Controverſie; but why you ſhould ſo do, I ſee no more reaſon, than to ſay *Joſh.* 22. mention'd any Miracles towards the compoſure of the difference between the two Tribes, and *Iſrael*; where in truth no ſuch thing can be found, though you ſeem to affirm it.

PAPIST.

In my laſt Paper, I took notice how you ſent us to Heaven for Miracles, to take up our Quarrels after the Example of Moſes, *whoſe cauſe was cleared that way: Here you deny you brought in the Inſtance of* Moſes *to this purpoſe, which, how true it is, every one that can reade muſt needs ſee. For, are not theſe your words?* But you ſay, Reaſon is on my ſide, *&c.* and demand by whom we muſt be tryed, who muſt take up the quarrel? I anſw. Even the ſame that took up quarrels of this nature in times paſt, *Exod.* 7, *&c. Do you not here tell us plainly, That God muſt take up our quarrels* * A S *he did thoſe of* Moſes? *And truly otherwiſe I might*

* Note, there is not the word *AS* in my words, only I ſay the ſame, that is, *God muſt take up our quarrels*; and how that muſt be, is ſhewed in my Anſwer following.

(*as*

(as you foreſaw) very poſſibly tell you, that your Allegation was nothing to the Queſtion, Who muſt take up the quarrel? *It is pretty to ſee what ſtuff you make of it, and then how you digreſs, to rail at our Baptiſm and Paſtours; I ſay, rail: for you bring no proof at all.*

BAPTIST.

I have ſaid enough to ſatisfie any reaſonable man, that it doth not follow from my alledging *Exod.7.* that I ſend you, or any body elſe, to Heaven for Miracles to decide our Controverſies. For at the firſt I ſhewed, that in the caſe of *Moſes* there was Miracle againſt Miracle; only God gave a note of diſtinction between thoſe ſigns, inſomuch as the Serpent that came of *Moſes* Rod devoured the other: from whence I only noted, That it's God's way to give ſome powerful note of diſtinction, between the Witneſs of his Servants, and Deceivers. And now, is not this my Obſervation very pertinent to our caſe? You ſay, you are the Church. We ſay, we are the Church. Here is Teſtimony againſt Teſtimony, as there was Miracle againſt Miracle; and if the Lord do not now give ſome powerful note of diſtinction between our Doctrine and yours, concerning the Church, as he did between *Stephen's* and the *Alexandrians*, I pray, who muſt take up the quarrel between *US?* Is it fit that you ſhould be Judge in your own caſe here? If ſo, why may not we? If the Councils and Fathers were of the Papal Church, then it is not any more reaſonable that you ſhould ſummon us to their Arbitriment, than it is for us to ſummon you to the Judgment of our Predeceſſors; but foraſmuch as *you* and *we* are agreed, that the Prophets and Apoſtles were infallibly aſſiſted to write the Mind of God for us to obſerve; therefore it's moſt reaſonable that we ſhould both appeal to them. If you object, the Prophets, *&c.* are not alive to interpret their Writings, and that our difference is about the ſenſe thereof; I Anſwer, This objection is every way as forceable againſt the Decrees of Councils, and Volumns of Fathers; for their Writings muſt be interpreted, expounded, *&c.* and we differ about the meaning of them. Secondly, the way you aſſign us to agree them, is to conſult them together, *&c.* Now I would know, why we may not be allowed this way to ſeek out the meaning of the Prophets and Apoſtles? In a word, there is not one Objection which yet I have met with, levelled againſt our appealing to holy Scripture, *&c.* as the only infallible means to decide all Controverſies between YOU and US; but the ſame objections are more forceable againſt all that you appeal to, for deciſion of the ſaid Controverſies.

PAPIST.

PAPIST.

You except againſt our Miracles, becauſe we bring them to prove our Church by; but if it appear as it doth, that God works Miracles upon thoſe that actually call upon his Bleſſed Mother, and his other Saints, or whilſt they are performing ſome of our Religious practices, which you abhor, is it not an argument that God approves them? It is God then, and not we, that brings Miracles to prove our Church.

BAPTIST.

You will ſtill have your Miracles to be an infallible mark of the truth of your Church, eſpecially thoſe of the Bleſſed Virgin (you mean the Image ſo called at *Loreto*) or as you phraſed it in your third Paper, *The Lady of Loreto*. But let me tell you, that there is ſmall cauſe you ſhould refer me to what is done there, as an infallible mark that your Church is the Church of Chriſt. For by the relation of two eye-witneſſes, which I have read, it is a place of moſt groſs Idolatry, blind devotion, and deceit. One of which Authors, was once a Teacher of your Church, who, before his ſeparation from you, travelled to *Loreto*, to ſee if the *Image of the Virgin* would inform him of the truth or falſhood of the Roman Church, as it is now conſtituted; for he was doubtful in this matter, and had been informed, that if any perſon were guilty of Mortal ſin (which if the Papal Church be the Church of Chriſt, he concluded he muſt needs be guilty of, in queſtioning her, at leaſt in the Judgment of the Fryers, who waited there upon that *Image*) he had been informed (I ſay) that if ſuch as were guilty of Mortal ſin, did but pray before the Lady of *Loreto*, the ſaid *Image* would either bluſh, or fall into a ſweat, and ſo reſolve the Petitioner in the affirmative. But if we may believe the Lady of *Loreto*, and this *Informant*, then it is no Mortal ſin to think, that the Papal Church is not the Church of Chriſt: For this doubtful man prayed earneſtly, and beheld the Lady as ſtedfaſtly, but no ſweat nor change befel her at all. Therefore, according to the Fryers rule, it is no Mortal ſin to think the Papal Church of *Rome* is not the Church of Chriſt.

But this one thing is eſpecially obſervable here, That whereas you would perſwade your ſelf, and others, that I ſend men to Heaven for Miracles to decide Controverſies; it is manifeſt that you are the man that is herein guilty: For the Controverſie is, *Whether the Papal Church of* Rome, *be the Church of Chriſt?* You affirm; I deny. To decide this Controverſie, you refer me to Miracles, as the

ſpecial

ſpecial means, or chief mark, whereby I may be reſolved in this matter, as is evident in this, and your two former Papers; So that what you would caſt upon me, falls clearly upon your ſelf, ſave that, inſtead of ſending me to Heaven, you ſend me to *Loreto*.

[In my Rejoynder I urged, *that of neceſſity the Scripture muſt decide all our Controverſies, as aforeſaid; becauſe, as things now ſtand, the Word (or Scripture) is antecedent to the Church, ſo that inaſmuch as it is impoſſible to find the Church without the Scripture, it ſuppoſes clearly that the Scripture muſt be found before the Church: and ſo, if the Scripture muſt of neceſſity reſolve this great Controverſie about the Church, it conſequently followeth that they muſt reſolve all Controverſies; becauſe all Religious Controverſies are involved in this one general Query*, Where is, and who are the Church?]

Something here, which the Adverſary doth further write, is omitted, becauſe it may be more fitly taken notice of afterward.

PAPIST.

I had reaſon to take notice of your general ſaying, that the Word was antecedent to Faith and the Church, ſince there was a Church, and conſequently Faith before the Scripture was written. Now it ſeems you meant not the Scripture by the Word, but I know not what Word, which was afterward committed to writing. It is paſt my underſtanding what Word you mean; for ſince it cannot be Verbum Scriptum *before it be written, It muſt either be* Verbum Traditum, *and I ſuppoſe you will not allow that; or* Verbum Dei Patris; *and that cannot be the Word you ſpeak of, as committed to writing.*

BAPTIST.

By that Word which was antecedent to Faith and the Church, as it relates to the Church under the Patriarchs, *&c.* I mean the Word
Heb. 1. 1. which God ſpake to them, and by them, at ſundry times, and in divers manners. And if you take that term [*Word*] to relate to the Church of Chriſt in its plantation, then I ſpeak partly of the written Word of God, and partly of that which was (at that time) only ſpoken by word of mouth, by Chriſt and his faithful Stewards; and if you will call this part of the word, *Verbum Traditum*, I ſay, that is the Word I ſpeak of. And I do alſo ſay, this Word was afterward committed to writing; which Word, together with the former, I mean that of the Prophets, is that whereon the Church (as now conſidered) is founded*, by which ſhe muſt be known. And in this
Eph. 2. 20. ſenſe, I ſay, the holy Scripture is now antecedent to the Church. And therefore well ſpake that Learned perſon, *Chryſoſtom*, when he fore-

* *Not denying Chriſt to be her foundation in the main.*

forewarned the ſons of men, that if they took heed to any thing, in order to their knowing the Church (in the latter times) beſide Scripture, they would fall headlong into the Abomination which maketh deſolate, and not be able to know the true Church.

Chriſoſt. Hom. in Mat. 24

BAPTIST.

I Think it meet here to give the Reader ſome account of my Judgment of theſe five Texts, which I brought to juſtifie my Anſwer to the firſt *Query*; which, with my *Anſwer*, was as followeth.

Qu. *Whether we are to reſolve all Differences in point of Religion, only out of the written Word of God?*

Anſw. The Spirit ſpeaking in the Scripture, together with right Reaſon as truely ſubſervient, is that whereby we are to reſolve all Differences, &c. For proof I cited, *Iſa.* 8. 20. 1 *Tim.* 6. 3. 1 *Joh.* 4. 6. 2 *Joh.* 9, 10. 2 *Theſſ.* 3. 2. where note, that under the term *We*, ought not to be underſtood, any perſon but the *Papiſts* on the one part, and the *Baptiſts* on the other, who do deny each other to be the Church of Chriſt.

Now that the Church is to defend her ſelf againſt all that come to ſpoil her of her Church-ſtate, by the Scripture onely (as that which includes her whole ſtrength) is that which I brought theſe Texts to prove.

And firſt for that place, *Iſa.* 8. 20. The Prophet foreſeeing a Judgment coming upon *Iſrael*, even ſuch, as God would hide himſelf from them; and the Law and Teſtimony ſhould be

PAPIST.

ONce more you offer to juſtifie your Conſequences drawn out of the five Texts. But I ask once more, To what purpoſe did you bring them? was it not to prove what you had ſaid in your Anſwer *to my* Query, *That the Scripture, ſo we took right Reaſon along with us, was ſufficient to reſolve all Controverſies in matters of Faith? No rational man can reade your firſt Paper but muſt think ſo; and indeed, otherwiſe you muſt have brought them to prove ſomething that was not under debate, which had been impertinent. Muſt not that very Aſſertion of yours be the Conſequence to theſe five Texts? and then, have I not reaſon to cry out, that there never appeared ſuch Monſtrous Conſequences? But, to avoid this inconvenience you fall into the other, and will have ſome of your Texts brought to prove certain Propoſitions, which you had not mentioned in your* Anſwer. *Howſoever, let us now ſee what you make of them.* Iſa. 8. 20. *God's People are commanded to have recourſe* rather *to the Law, &c. than to ſuperſtitious Oracles,* Ad Legem magis, &c. *And they have a ſign*

BAPTIST.

be like a Book bound and sealed up; as ver. 16 & 17. compared with ch. 29. 11, 12. The Prophet likewise foreseeing, that when God should hide his face, *Israel* would enquire of Wisards, and such as spoke from familiar Spirits (as *Saul* did, when under the like judgment, as 1 *Sam.* 28. 6, 7, 8.) wherefore the Prophet, that he might warn the remnant of faithful ones, whom he foresaw would be as wonders amongst the rest, commands them, as from the Lord, that WHEN men should say unto them, Seek unto such as have familiar spirits, &c. to go to the LAW, as being their way to go to God himself: for saith he, *Should not a People seek unto their God? To the LAW, &c.* and certifies them that by that they should know Deceivers; for, saith he, *If they speak not according to This Word,* [the Law] *there is no light in them:* So that I infer thus much, that when such as are enemies to the Church come to invade the Saints with their deceit, the only infallible way to know them to be Deceivers, is, to enquire of God's Law and Testimony. I know that *Israel* had the Testimony or standing Oracle, beside the written Law. And the *Church* now hath the new Testimony open in the *Church*, beside the Law & Prophets; & hereunto, I say, the Church is only to apply her self, as aforesaid, to find out the deceit of those who would rob her of that inheritance, which she holdeth by the deeds of God's Law, and Promises, contained in Scripture

PAPIST.

given them to convince such Oracles of falshood, if they speak not according to the Word or Prophesie *of* Isaiah. *This is the clear sense of that place, out of which you draw this strange consequence.* Ergo, *the Scripture, &c. is to resolve all matters of Faith. A strange Consequence, I say, as will appear, if we turn your Euthymeme into a Syllogism, thus: Recourse is to be had rather to the Law, than to false Oracles, whose falsehood appears, if they speak not according to the Word or Prophecy of* Isaiah. *But if this be so, the* Scriptures, &c. *are to resolve all points of Faith.* Ergo, &c. *What a prodigious* minor *have we here? How doth it follow, that because God's Word is to be more credited than superstitious Oracles; or, that such Oracles are not to be credited, when they speak against God's Word: Therefore the Scriptures, &c. are to resolve all points of Faith. I know you have not the word* rather *in your English Translation as we have in ours, but the clear sense of the place bears as much.*

1 Tim. 6. 3. *saith, they are proud that teach contrary to the Doctrine of Christ.* Ergo, *you infer that the Scripture is to judge whose Doctrine is of pride.*

This

BAPTIST.

Scripture; by theſe, as the *only infallible Rule*, ſhe knows thoſe to be lyars, *who ſay they are the Church, and are not.*

And to this agrees the next three Scriptures, the very reading whereof ſheweth, that when the Controverſie is between the Church and ſuch as pretend falſly to that Title, the onely infallible means to refel them, is, the *Spirit ſpeaking in Scripture, &c.*

For thus ſaith the firſt of them: *If any man teach otherwiſe, and conſent not to wholſom words, even the words of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, and the Doctrine that is according to Godlineſs, he is proud, knowing nothing, but doting about queſtions, &c.*

Thus ſaith the ſecond, *He that knoweth God, heareth us: he that is not of God, heareth not us. Hereby know we the Spirit of Truth, and the ſpirit of Error.*

The third ſaith thus, *Whoſo tranſgreſſeth, and abideth not in the Doctrin of Chriſt, hath not God. He that abideth in the Doctrine of Chriſt, hath both the Father and the Son. If there come any unto you, and bring not this Doctrine, receive him not into your houſe, neither bid him God-ſpeed.*

From theſe Texts it appears, that unleſs the *Papiſts* can produce ſomething which they can infallibly prove to be Chriſt's Doctrine, beſide what is contained in holy Scripture; or, that the Apoſtles may be heard as infallibly by ſome other means, as by the holy Scripture; or, that the Saints

PAPIST.

This is as mad a concluſion as the laſt; for when there is no clear Text of Scripture for either ſide, as it often happens, or Scripture brought on both ſides; How can the Scripture judge whether party be proud? or, how can it be judge of its own ſenſe, when it is alledged on both ſides, who both pretend to have the Spirit and Reaſon on their ſides?

1 John 4.6. *Thoſe that hear not the Apoſtles, are not of God, nor have his Spirit.* Ergo, *ſay you, the Scripture reſolves who are religious: Doth it follow out of this Text, that when parties contend, that they hear the Apoſtles, the Scripture, can reſolve the difference, and pronounce who are religious? &c. Not at all.*

2 John 9. 10. *Gives Judgement againſt thoſe that follow not Chriſt's Doctrine. You infer ergo the Scripture muſt try whether men bring this Doctrine. Strange Logick: for unleſs your Text proved that the Scripture containes all Chriſt's Doctrine, which it doth not, your Conſequence muſt needs be faulty.*

2 Theſſ. 3. 2. *you ſay proves, that Reaſon is ſome wayes neceſſary to decide Controverſies in Religion. I will not examine the goodneſs of this Conſequence, but I am ſure you need not have*

BAPTIST.

Saints received some Doctrine for Christs, that is not contained in the Scripture; I say, unless they can infallibly shew something of this nature, my Answer is good. But if they can produce any other thing of such authority, then I acknowledge my Answer to be deficient. Howbeit, if any man, or the Church her self, do decide a Controversie, by insisting upon the Scripture, this is no more than my Answer included; for I do not imagine that the Church must not pronounce what is contained in the Scripture: but if she hath power to speak as from the Lord (in these dayes) when yet the Scripture saith no such thing, then I profess my self short of understanding the power of the Church.

2 *Thess.* 3. 2. I only made use of this Text thus far, that in Religious Controversies the Apostle gives Reason her place, and therefore desired to be delivered from unreasonable men.

PAPIST.

brought Scripture to have proved so manifest a Truth, which cannot be denied by any, but such as pretend to have so much of the Spirit, that me-thinks they should have little need of the use of Reason.

BAPTIST.

Concerning my five Texts, and what I infer thence, I need not speak much here; yet it is worthy observing how apparantly you miss the clear sense of *Isa.* 8. 20. whilst you restrain the relatives [this word] to the Word or Prophecy of *Isaiah*, whereas it is as clear as the Sun at noon, that they ought to be referr'd to the Law and Testimony; for thus *I* read, *To the Law and to the Testimony, if they speak not according to This Word.* Having thus missed the sence of the Text, then in all that you say further, you discover a taunting spirit, endeavouring to bespatter me with what dirt comes next to hand.

I did not quote any one of the *five Texts*, as taking it singly to prove the whole Assertion; and therefore you did injure my understanding, to argue from them apart, as brought to prove the whole Position; but I brought them to prove such Propositions, as being laid together, do amount to so much as my Assertion (as I explicate it) doth contain. For the first *four Texts* do *all of them* shew, how God's People ought to try and defend themselves against such as oppose the Church and Truth of God, as I shewed in my *Rejoynder*: and the *fifth*, gives Reason her place in Religious Contests. But there is not one of the Arguments which I formed from my *five Quotations*, but you deprave and abuse it, by both adding terms of your own,

own, and omitting mine; yea, ſometimes whole ſentences: and when you have ſo done, you flout at the Concluſions. Which dealing is too bad for a ſober Diſputant,

It were a very eaſie thing to turn all your Objections here againſt the Scripture as inſufficient to reſolve differences in Religion, upon the Church as therefore inſufficient to reſolve them. For, whereas you ſay, That when both Parties pretend to have Scripture and Reaſon on their ſides, then the Scripture cannot decide the Controverſie; Might not I as well ſay, when both parties pretend to have the Church on their ſide (as that's the caſe between us) the Church then cannot decide our difference?

Again, where you ſeem to ſay, that when both parties contending, do ſay they hear the Apoſtles, that then the Apoſtles cannot (as they ſpeak in the Scriptures) decide the Controverſie: Hath not this the ſame force againſt the Church, when both parties contend they hear the Church? See how you can defend your ſelf, and I doubt not but therein you will defend my Arguments for the Scripture.

And becauſe you do cry up the Fathers, *&c.* for ſo clear a way to decide all our Controverſies, I will therefore ſhew you, that they do clearly avouch the *Anſwer* which I have given to this your firſt *Query*, as will evidently appear to the impartial Reader of the ſeveral Quotations which I have before alledged, and which do here follow.

The ANSWER *to the* FIRST QUERY, *Avouched ſufficient by the Sentence of divers* DOCTORS, *both Antient and Modern.*

WHether of us be Schiſmaticks? ask not me, I will not ask you. Let Chriſt be asked, that he may ſhew us his Church. *Aug. cont. Petil. c. 85*

Neither muſt I alledge the *Nicene* Council; nor you the *Arimi*. I am neither bound to the one, nor you to the other; let the matter be tryed by the Scripture. *Aug. cont. Max. l. 3. c. 14*

Auguſtine ſaith, Let the Scriptures judge; let Chriſt judge; let the Apoſtles judge. Yea, it is confeſſed by the Papiſts, that *Aug. Optatus*, and *Baſil*, ſummoned their Adverſaries to the arbitriment of holy Scriptures, and did allow the ſufficiency of holy Scripture to decide the Controverſies depending between them. S. N. *Antidot.*

In

Chryſoſt. Hom. in Matth. In time paſt, ſaith *Chryſoſtome*, there were many wayes to know the Church of Chriſt (*viz.*) by good Life, by Miracles, by Chaſtity, *&c.* but from the time that *Hereſies* did take hold of the Church, it *IS ONLY* known by the Scripture, which is the true Church.

Again, he ſaith, The Lord then knowing that ſo great confuſion would come in the latter dayes, therefore willed the Chriſtians that would take to the ſureneſs of true Faith, to have refuge to nothing but to the Scripture; otherwiſe, ſaith he, if they regard other things they ſhall periſh, not underſtanding what the true Church is.

[Thus my Anſwer, is avouched good, as it reſpects the means to decide the differences which are about the Church. Next, hear what they ſay touching ſuch differences as are in the Church.]

Iren. l. 3 cap. 4. *Iren.* If there be any diſagreement riſen up among Chriſtians concerning Controverſies in Religion, what better courſe is there to be taken, than to have our recourſe into the Moſt antient Churches, [which muſt needs be thoſe planted by the Apoſtles, conſidering the time when he lived] and to receive from thence, what ſhall be certain and manifeſt.

Aug. 7. Tome cont. Eref. *Auguſtine.* Becauſe the Scripture cannot deceive, whoſo feareth to be miſled in the obſcurity of this Queſtion, let him ask *COUNSEL* of that Church which the *SCRIPTURE*, without any ambiguity pointeth out.

Conſtantine Mag. There are the Goſpel, the Prophets and Apoſtles, which do teach us what to hold in Religion; wherefore expelling all hoſtile and bitter contention, let us ſeek the Solution of theſe Queſtions out of the Scriptures. Thus ſpake this famous Emperor in the Council of *Nice*, at what time the Biſhops had like to have jarred into pieces.

THus have I given an impartial Relation of what hath paſſed between the *Popiſh Queriſt* and my *Self*, in our *two laſt Papers*, (which contains the ſum of what paſſed in the other) as touching this Queſtion about the Judge of Controverſies. And now, for further ſatisfaction, That the Scripture, as aforeſaid, ought to be admitted the high Prerogative of Judge in our Debates; conſider, that *of neceſſity it muſt be ſo.* My reaſon is, becauſe either the Scripture, or ſome other Writings, muſt be our Judge, eſpecially in this important Queſtion, *WHICH IS THE TRUE CHURCH?* For when we contend about her, it is very unreaſonable, that any party contending

contending for that title, ſhould be permitted to give Judgment in their own cauſe: As for example, The preſent Aſſembly of *Papiſts* ſay, *That they are the true Church:* and the preſent Aſſemblies of *Baptiſts* ſay, *That they are the true Church.* Is it fit that either party contending, ſhould here give Judgment deciſſive? What then muſt we do? why *of neceſſity* we muſt to ſome Writings, whereby to be decided or agreed in this Controverſie. Theſe Writings muſt be either the Scriptures, or ſome other; but no other can compare with thoſe, ſo that they do deſerve this Prerogative better than any other.

The *Papiſts* ordinary way in this difficulty, is to tell us, that we muſt here be tryed by the Tradition of our Fore-fathers; in which they ſay, *we cannot be deceived:* which Tradition, they ſay, is *the only thing that is unqueſtionable, and needs no other ground to ſtand upon, but it ſelf.* And againſt the Scripture's being received, upon its own evidence or authority, they uſually do thus object, *that before we can receive what it teacheth, we muſt be aſſured of its truth.* And again, they ſay, *the Scripture may not be the Judge of Controverſie, becauſe it may be corrupted, tranſlated, ill interpreted, not rightly underſtood.* And by theſe, and other like objections, they uſually in all their Writings, invalidate the Scriptures certainty, authority, and ſufficiency, that ſo they advance the authority of their Traditions. *Author 7. Qu.* T. B. *End to Contro.*

x *might*

But let it be ſeriouſly conſidered, whether theſe Objections have not the ſame force againſt what they reſt upon, which they have againſt the holy Scripture? Firſt then, whereas they tell us, *the Scripture cannot teach us any thing, till we be aſſured of its truth:* Doth not this conclude againſt any other thing as ſtrongly? Ought we not to be aſſured of the truth of the Church before we receive her documents? Ought we not to be aſſured of the truth of that Tradition which we receive for the Rule of our Faith? But how muſt we be aſſured of the truth of the Papal Church, and Tradition? There is not a man living, that can remember when either began, and ſo avouch its beginning to be of *divine Inſtitution*, and the continnance of the ſame ever ſince its beginning, to have been without any corruption: What then muſt we do? Why we muſt ſearch *Romes* Records. And then I ask, are they not as queſtonable, and liable to miſ-interpretations, as eaſily miſ-underſtood as the Records of God? What is now become of theſe Objections, the force whereof is evidently againſt the Papal Church and her Traditions, of the truth whereof we muſt be aſſured BEFORE we can be taught by either of them.

I ſay

I ſay again, There is not a man of all the *Papiſts* that can evidence *Rome* to have been a Church two hundred years ago, and then much leſs one thouſand ſix hundred years ago. So that *OF NECESSITY* we muſt to the Writings of ſome men (whom we never ſaw write one word) to find the Church. And then *I* would know why we may not make enquiry at the Pen of *Paul*, what the Church was at firſt, and what it ought to be now, as well as at the Pen of *Auguſtine*. Cannot the Pen of *Peter* the Apoſtle give us as good information in this matter, as the Pen of any *Pope*, pretending to be his Succeſſor? If the *Papiſts* anſwer, That we know not the Pen of *Peter* or *Paul*: We anſwer, as well as they know the Pen of *Auguſtine* or *Gregory*. If they ſay *Paul's* Writings may be corrupted, and muſt be interpreted, may be miſ-underſtood. *I* return the ſame Anſwer of all other Books whatſoever; yea, thoſe which contains *Romes* Tradition. See therefore what is gained by deviſiug objections againſt the authority or certainty of the holy Scriptures. Such doings do only tend to the deſtruction of all Faith, making every thing doubtful, and the effect is the uſhering in of all uncleanneſs on the one hand, or if men miſs this ſnare, they are catched in another, *viz.* to walk at random as their own, or other mens fancy leads them. This is evident by what we have ſeen in the *Ranters* on the one hand, and the *Papiſts* and *Quakers* on the other.

Let us trace this matter a little further, thus. The *Papiſts* Traditions (moſt, if not all of which, have been committed to Writing ſeveral hundreds of years ago) muſt ſpeak for themſelves, are unqueſtionable of themſelves, muſt challenge no ground but themſelves to ſtand upon: But the ſacred Scripture which hath eſpecial Promiſe from God for its preſervation, *Pſal.* 12. muſt have none of theſe high priviledges allowed it; Is not this a moſt peccant Aſſertion? Again, *Peter* and *Paul* muſt be no Judges of Controverſies in Religion, as they ſpeak to us in their Epiſtles; but the *Popes* of *Rome*, dead long ago, and now only ſpeak in their Writings, yet they muſt be our infallible Judges in theſe Controverſies. The great Council of Apoſtles, Elders, and Brethren, *Acts* 15. can be no Judge of any Controverſie, though their Decrees are yet extant among us; but the Council of *Trent*, who only ſpeak in their Decrees, muſt be our Judge, and that *ſo* as from their Judgments no appeal can be admitted. The Apoſtolical Council ſends forth their Decrees in the Name of the holy Ghoſt, and themſelves; and in thoſe their Decrees, they prohibit the eating of blood, and ſtrangled things, *&c.* But the Papal Councils will ſend forth a Decree directly

oppoſite

oppoſite to this, and yet ſign'd with theſe powerful words; *Viſum eſt Spiritui Sancto & nobis.* If we appeal in this matter to the Apoſtolical Council, they may not be permitted to pronounce a Sentence deciſſive. But *from* the ſentence of the Papal Council we muſt in no wiſe appeal. Can any thing be ſaid more unworthily?

Thus then, Firſt, the godly Reader may perceive, That whether he be able to anſwer all the cunning Objections that men, by reaſon of the long experience they have had in the wayes of deceit, have found out; yet he hath an Argument of *NECESSITY* wherewith to oppoſe their ſubtilty. And, Secondly, he hath the advantage of all their own objections, againſt themſelves; yea, againſt their Church, Tradition, and all that they ſtand upon. Being ſeaſonably retorted upon them. Wherefore I ſhall conclude with the *Pſalmiſt's* words, *Pſal.* 64. 5, 6, 7, 8, 9.

They encourage themſelves in an evil matter: they commune of laying ſnares privily; they ſay, Who ſhall ſee them?

They ſearch out iniquities, they accompliſh a diligent ſearch: both the inward thoughts of every one of them, and the heart is deep.

But God ſhall ſhoot at them with an arrow, ſuddenly ſhall they be wounded.

So they ſhall make their own tongues to fall upon themſelves: all that ſee them, ſhall flee away.

And all men ſhall fear, and ſhall declare the work of God: for they ſhall wiſely conſider of his doings.

THE SECOND PART, SHEWETH,

That the preſent Papal Church *of* Rome, *is not the* Church *of* Chriſt, *for divers important Cauſes or Reaſons.*

WE have heard of how dangerous a Conſequence that Papal Opinion is, which leads them to ſet up their own Authority (under pretence of their being the Church) above the holy Scripture; inſomuch as they allow it no Authority, till it be delivered to us for God's Word, by their Church; ſo that by this Doctrine, we muſt find their Church, before we can find the Word of God, as it is contained in the Scripture.

Upon which Conſideration, we ſhall endeavour to ſhew, That the preſent Papal Church, is not the true Church of Chriſt; and therefore what Power ſoever the Church hath, yet they cannot have it; Becauſe they are not the Church of Chriſt.

The Firſt Reaſon.

The preſent Papal Church of *Rome*, cannot poſſibly prove her ſelf to be the Church of Chriſt: Therefore ſhe is not the Church of Chriſt.

The Firſt Reaſon maintained.

THe Conſequence of the Argument no underſtanding man can deny; for unleſs a party pretending to be the Church of Chriſt, can ſome wayes ſufficiently prove that they are his Church, they cannot reaſonably blame any body that refuſes ſo to account of them. And for the Antecedent, namely, that it is impoſſible for the preſent Papal

Papal Church to prove her ſelf the Church of Chriſt, it is evident from this ground, *viz.* They make both the Scripture, and all other Writings, depend on their Church for their Authority; and therefore they muſt prove themſelves to be the Church without the help of any authentical or authoritative Writings; which thing is impoſſible for them to do.

Being thus diveſted of the help of all Records, as is more fully ſhewed above, there remains now nothing for them to lean upon but their own Evidence, or the Tradition of their Fore-fathers; not that which is contained in any Records, but only that which hath been delivered by word from man to man, *&c.* But alas! what Tradition is this they ſpeak of? Not the Tradition of the Church to us, till the perſons delivering the ſame, be found to be the Church; which, as before, they cannot be found to be, without the Scripture. And for their own Evidence, that may not prove them to be the Church to thoſe that contend with them; it cannot avail them, ſith each party contending in this caſe, will, and may, as reaſonably as the *Papiſts*, look that their own Teſtimony ſhould be as available for theſe, as the other for thoſe.

It is as vain here to tell us, they are the Church, becauſe the true marks of the Church do agree to the Papal Church, and none elſe. For, firſt, the true marks of the Church are confeſſed by the *Papiſts*, to be found in the Scripture; which Scripture they receive not, but from the authority of their Church (*yea, their preſent Church*) ſo that till the Scripture can tell us authoritatively which be the marks of the Church, no Church can be found by thoſe marks; nor can the Scripture tell us of thoſe marks authoritatively, till *Rome*, as a Church, give it us for God's Word: So then *Rome* muſt be found the Church, before there be any marks to find her by; which is impoſſible. *Author of the 7. Queries*

As for example: To clear this matter further, the *Papiſts* ſay, *That Holineſs is a mark of the true Church:* But now ſet the Holy Scripture aſide, and how ſhall I know *holineſs* from *unholineſs*, without the Scripture? Here the *Papiſts* being in a ſtrait, rather than they will let the Law of God, or the Scripture, have the preheminence, do Anſwer thus; That *we have a Law in our Conſciences, which dictates what is good, and what is otherwiſe; and by this Law, even a Heathen may judge our Church holier than any other Congregations of Chriſtians.* *Author of the 7. Queries*

What a miſerable plunge (of *Heatheniſm* or *Quakeriſm*) are they brought to here? How do they know that a *Heathen* may, by the

Law of Conſcience, judge their Church to be more holy than ANY other Congregation of Chriſtians? Were they ever *Heathens* to know this? But alas! what holineſs can a *Heathen* judge of? Surely not that which is an infallible mark of the true Church; for this Spiritual matter is fooliſhneſs to the Natural man, nor can he know it, becauſe 'tis ſpiritually diſcerned. It is true, there is *a Holineſs* diſcernable by the Law of our Conſciences. But this only, is not an infallible mark, that any Society is the Church of Chriſt; nor did ever any man (I am perſwaded) hold forth ſuch a Doctrine, that was a faithful Miniſter of the New Teſtament, or Spirit.

Again, What of this kind of *Holineſs*, whereof a *Heathen* (as ſuch) can judge, is there found among the *Papiſts*, which may not be found among the *Baptiſts*? yea, among thoſe that are oppoſite to both, as the *Quakers*, and others; yea, among the very *Jews* and *Turks* may be found as much of this kind of *Holineſs* as among the *Papiſts*, if any credit may be given to Hiſtories.

Sometimes the *Papiſts* do object the * *Creed* as ſufficient, to demonſtrate a man to be a Member of the Church, though he know not whether there be any Scripture. But I Anſwer, How ſhall this be proved to be the *Creed*? it muſt not be its own evidence; for then the Scripture may as well ſpeak for it ſelf, which the *Papiſts* will not allow; nor can the Church of *Rome* confer any authority upon the *Creed*, till they be found to be the Church: So then this is the Concluſion, *Rome* muſt be found to be the Church, before there be a *Creed*.

I do therefore humbly deſire theſe few Obſervations may be ſeriouſly thought upon by all ſober men, but eſpecially the *Papiſts*, that ſo men may give to the holy Scriptures, that which is proper to them; that is, That they may ſpeak, without controul, both for themſelves, and every thing elſe of a Religious conſideration; or elſe all Volumns of the Antients, and Societies of men, pretending to Chriſtianity (as things ſtand in our dayes) muſt depart into utter ſilence.

* *It would be here noted, That neither the marks of* Unity, Univerſalilty, &c. *nor the* Creed, *do prove a People that hath them all, to be the Church; becauſe none of them mention* Baptiſm, *without which there cannot be a viſible Church.*

The Second Reaſon.

The preſent Papal Church of *Rome*, hath no Baptiſm: Therefore ſhe is not the Church of Chriſt.

The Second Reaſon maintained.

BY the word *Baptiſm* in the Argument, I mean only the *Baptiſm of Water in the Name of the Father, &c.* or, which is all one, the *Baptiſm of Repentance for the Remiſſion of ſins*. Now that the preſent Papal Church of *Rome* hath not this Baptiſm, is evident by this Argument, taken from their own Confeſſion, *viz.*

The Baptiſm of the true Church is found in the Scripture. But the Baptiſm of the preſent Papal Church of *Rome* is not grounded upon, nor mentioned in the Scripture. Therefore the preſent Papal Church of *Rome* hath no Baptiſm.

The firſt Propoſition is moſt clear, from *Matth.*28. 19,20. *Act.*2. *Act.* 8. *Act.* 9. *Act.* 16. *Act.* 18. *Act.* 19. *Act.* 22. 16. *Rom.* 6. *Gal.* 3. 27. *Col.*2.11, 12. *Heb.*6. 1, 2. 1 *Pet.* 3. 21.

And, that the Papiſts Baptiſm is not found in the Scripture, I prove thus. Becauſe they themſelves do confeſs, that Infant Baptiſm is not mentioned in the Scripture, nor grounded upon the Scripture, nor any Scripture for it. See to this purpoſe, the Works of *Bellarmine*; and a Book, entituled, *An Antidote*, written by *S. N.* a Popiſh Doctor; as alſo *T. B.* his *End to Controverſie*. In which Books you will find the very words which I have repeated. Adde hereunto the Anſwer which I received from the Author of the *Seven Queries*, when *I* asked him what Controverſies in Religion he could reſolve without the written Word of God? he aſſigned *Infant Baptiſm*, as one that was ſo to be reſolved.

So then, we have it *pro confeſſo* from the Papiſts own mouths, That their Baptiſm (which is *Infant Baptiſm*) is a *Scriptureleſs-Baptiſm*: Therefore ſay I, it is no Baptiſm.

No Baptiſm, I ſay; becauſe the Church hath but one Baptiſm of Water, and it is mentioned in the Scripture, and grounded upon it, and much Scripture found for it; ſo is not *Infant Baptiſm*, which is the Baptiſm of the preſent Papal Church. Therefore the Papal Baptiſm, is no Baptiſm. How can they defend themſelves? Will they ſay, the Church hath a Scripture-Baptiſm, and an unwritten Baptiſm? This they muſt ſay and prove, or elſe deny their *Infant Baptiſm*.

But

But, ſecondly, The preſent Papal Church is ſo adulterated in the manner of the Adminiſtration of Baptiſm, as that, had they a true ſubject for Baptiſm, yet, they would be found to have no Baptiſm. This will appear as clear as the Light, from the Papiſts own confeſſion; for they grant, *that the antient and primitive way of baptizing, was, by dipping the party baptized, over the head and ears in Water; and that it was their Church which changed this way, to a little ſprinkling upon the forehead.* This is plainly to be ſeen in a Book, entituled, *Certamen Religioſum.*

This bold Change, which men, without any allowance from God, have made in this Miniſtration of Baptiſm, is directly againſt the Scripture. *Mat.* 3. 16. *Mark* 15. 9. *John* 3. 23. *Act.* 8. 38, 39. *Rom.* 6. In all which places it's evident, that our Lord Jeſus, *John Baptiſt*, and the other *Baptiſts* of thoſe times, did ſo underſtand the mind of God in reſpect of the manner of the Adminiſtration of Baptiſm, as that they thought it could not be done without ſo much Water as they might go into (both the Perſon baptizing, and the Perſon to be baptized) And now, do not all that will preſume to ſatisfie themſelves in this thing with a few drops of Water put on the face only, from a Man's fingers ends, or out of a Glaſs in the Midwifes pocket, lay great folly and ignorance to the charge of Chriſt and his primitive followers? doubtleſs ſuch, as is not leſs than the folly of that man, that hath occaſion only for one Gill of Water, and he may take it up at the ſide of the Brook, and yet will needs wade into the middle of a River to take it up; or a man that hath occaſion to waſh his hands only, which he may perform very commodiouſly without wetting his foot, and yet is ſo ſimple that he will needs go into the middle of the River to that purpoſe, eſpecially ſuch a River where there is much Water. I ſay, the practice of Sprinkling which the Papiſts and others uſe, if that anſwer the mind of God in the caſe of Baptiſm, doth even thus reflect upon Chriſt and the Chriſtians in thoſe dayes. But let our Saviours practice herein be juſtified, and all ſuch practices as tend to the rendring it ridiculous, condemned.

The Papiſts only Reſerve for the defence of *Infant Baptiſm*, is this: They ſay it is an *Apoſtolical Tradition*, that is, a Precept delivered by the Apoſtles Word, but not mentioned in their Writings.

This I ſhall ſhew to be utterly falſe, for divers important Reaſons. Firſt, No Apoſtolical Tradition, tends to the making null or void any Apoſtolical Writing. But Infant Sprinkling makes null and void all that is written in the Scriptures, concerning the ſubject and manner

ner of Baptism, in all that part of the World where the Papists (or such as they) get the Civil Power on their side: yea, we see that by this means the sons of men are great enemies to the way of God in this matter. How long have many Nations lain destitute of the knowledge of the *Baptism of Repentance for the remission of sins*, by reason of the interposition of this cloudy Tradition of *Pedo-Rantism*? How have men, pretending to be Ministers of Christ, never, in many Generations, preached *Peter*'s Doctrine, *Repent, and be baptized, every one of you, for the Remission of sins*? Note this Observation well; for although the Baptism of Repentance, *&c.* hath not been cryed down in the Nations of Christendom, (by such as counted themselves the only Preachers of the Gospel) yet it was not for that these Nations had no need of the practice of Baptism; for they daily have practised something under that notion, which is their Infant-sprinkling; So that it's plain, Infant-Baptism makes void the Apostolical Writings: Therefore Infant-Baptism is no Apostolical Tradition.

Secondly, Infant-Baptism is not an Apostolical Tradition, because no mention is made of it in the first hundred of years after Christ. Although I am not much read, yet I have used the utmost of my diligence to know the Truth in this Point, and I have attained to sufficient satisfaction, that the greatest favourer of Infant-Baptism that yet I have met with, durst not say that ever he saw any Record of Antiquity that mentioned such a thing, and that the Scriptures do not mention it, the Papists grant.

And because the Papists make such boast of the consent which they ve in this matter from Antiquity, I will therefore here put in thing by way of Evidence to the contrary. For it is certain that Baptism, as it was not heard of in the first hundred, so neis it generally received till above half a thousand years revolm Christ, as is undeniable; for that it is plain, that famous (or at least, very famous) Christian Parents up their Children without having them baptized; he Parents of *Greg. Nazianzen*, *Ambrose*, *Au*others; yea, the Emperour *Constantius*, born of rents, was not baptized till he was about age*. See also these ensuing Testimonies.

unto you, how we offer up our selves unto God in hat we are renewed through Christ, such as are h, and believe that which we teach them, being he same; we admonish to fast and pray, and em; then they are brought to the Water,

**See a Book, entituled, A well-grounded Treatise concerning Baptism.*

Justin Mart. in orat. ad Autho. pium.

and

and there calling on the Name of the Father, *&c.* they are washed *in it.* So saith *Erasmus, paraphrase* on *Matth.*28. *If they believe that which you teach them, and begin to be repentant of their former life, then dip them* In Water, *In the Name, &c.*

*Jerom. super Mat.*28 The Lord commanded his Apostles, that they should first instruct all Nations, and afterward *baptise* those that were instructed: for it cannot be that the body should receive the Sacrament of Baptism, unless the soul have received *before* the true Faith.

Athan. in serm. 3. cont. Arrian. Our Saviour did not slightly command to baptize, but first of all he said, *teach*, and then *baptize*, that true Faith might come by *teaching*, and Baptism be perfected by *Faith.*

Haimo saith, *In this place* (Matth. 28.) *is set down a Rule rightly how to baptize*, that is, *that Teaching should go before Baptism: for*, he saith, *Teach all Nations*, (and then he saith) *and baptize them: for, he that is to be baptized, must be before instructed, that he first learn to believe, that which in Baptism he shall receive: For, as Faith without Works is dead; so Works, if they have no Faith, are nothing worth.*

Haimo. in postil. sup. text

Beda *super Act.*19. *Beda* saith, *All they that came to the Apostles to be baptized, were instructed of them, and when they were instructed concerning the Sacrament of Baptism, they received the holy administration thereof.*

Tertullian, who lived about the time when Infant-Baptism began to appear, did dispute against it, as an unnecessary practice, for divers causes. 1. *For that it is not meet to commit heavenly things, to those who are not capable of keeping treasure of an earthly nature.* 2. *For th the Sponsors might be endangered.* 3. *For that it became them were to be baptized, to fast, pray, and confess their sins.* 4. *Be they that receive Christ, must ask him; let them* (that is, little come therefore, saith he, *while they are youths, whilst wherein th they are taught, &c.*

Tertul. *qui sunt Bapt. parvil.*

Augustine saith, *We spend much time in exhorting those whe tize*—— *Ludovicus vives*, commenting upon this place, *any man should mistake this place of* Augustine, *let him know time it was the custom to baptize NONE, except they wer and did desire Baptism in their own persons, and that sever did understand what that Mystical Water meant, which w in our baptizing of Infants.*

Aug. de Civitat. Dei.

[Lo here your Pedo-baptism is not the old cu

The Third Reaſon.

The preſent Papal Church of *Rome*, is a National Church: Therefore ſhe is not the Church of Chriſt.

The third Reaſon maintained.

1. TO make the Goſpel-Church National, conſequently deſtroyes the Doctrin of Converſion, as it is a principle of the Doctrin of Chriſt appertaining to the beginning of a Chriſtian man: For, if men can regenerate, or beget perſons to God in their infancy, then the Word of Regeneration or new-birth is needleſs in order to our admiſſion into the Church of Chriſt, and ſo the preaching of Faith and Repentance muſt ceaſe (*as it is a Principle pertaining to a Chriſtian man*) in all thoſe Nations which are called *Chriſtendom*, which is a great part of the World. And indeed, Experience hath long ago proved this Concluſion to be moſt true; for ſince the Church (as they term it) was National, the Word, or Work of Converſion, hath been little known in the life and power of it: nay, verily, the very term [*Converſion*] is become a reproach among our National-Church-members. But thus to make the Word of Converſion unneceſſary, in order to perſons admiſſion into the Church of Chriſt, is contrary to the Scripture, *John* 3. 5. *Luke* 24. 47. *Matth.* 20. 19. 2 *Cor.* 5. 16, 17. *Heb.* 8. 10, 11. *Gal.* 3. 26, 27, 28. *Matth.* 3. 8, 9, 10.

2. To make the Goſpel-Church National, puts an end to the Doctrine of Chriſt touching that Separation, and thoſe Diviſions, which for the Goſpel-ſake *muſt be in Nations and Families*, as appears from theſe Scriptures; *John* 15. 19. and 17. 14, 16. *Acts* 2. 40, 47. 1 *Cor.* 6. *Luke* 12. 49, to 54. And therefore in vain doth any perſon think to do God ſervice, by compelling Families, Towns, Countries, Nations, or many Nations, to be of one mind in matters of Religion. I ſay, it is in vain, becauſe the Scripture foreſees, and alſo foreſhews, that the contrary effects muſt follow the preaching of the Goſpel; and yet they may, yea, and ought to live in one form of Civil Government: for that is the will of God concerning *every ſoul*, *Rom.* 13. 1, to 8.

3. The Goſpel-Church cannot be National; becauſe that takes away from her, Perſecution for the Goſpel-ſake, & makes her become a Perſecutor: For it is impoſſible for a Church to be National without penal Laws, whereby to force men to that kind of Worſhip which

the greater part approveth, which may as poſſibly be falſe as true. But the true Church muſt not look to be free from Perſecution, if ſhe
† 2 *Cor.* 5.20. live godly in *Chriſt Jeſus*; nor is any thing more † *uncomly* for her than to puniſh or perſecute men into a Conformity to her Faith or religious practice, *John* 15. 19, 20. *Mat.* 10. 22. 2 *Tim.* 3. 12. *Luke* 9. 56. And the greateſt part of the *Revelations* do ſhew, that the Church was to be in a ſuffering condition, and are therefore bid to *be patient, until the coming of the Lord*, Jam. 5.

4. A National-Church cannot obſerve the diſcipline of the Church of Chriſt; for, in the caſe of withdrawing from diſorderly perſons, they do not only ſeparate men of diſorder from the Church, both in Civil and Religious concerns, but they caſt them wholly out of the World, from all Markets and Fairs, yea, quite out of their Livelihoods, *&c.* which kind of Excommunication the Scripture foreſees to be proper to the Churches Adverſary, *Rev.* 13. 16, 17.

5. If the Goſpel-Church ought to be National, then ſhe was imperfect in point of Power in the Apoſtles dayes: for ſhe had not then any Power to put Hereticks to death for their Hereſie. But to ſay, that the Primitive Church wanted any Power to puniſh any ſin, as it concerns the Church to puniſh it, is to diſparage the Apoſtolical Churches, and is alſo contrary to the Scriptures, which plainly ſhew they had Power then to revenge all diſobedience, 2 *Cor.* 10. 4, 5, 6.

The Fourth Reaſon.

The Papal Church encreaſeth her ſelf more by the Carnal Sword, than by the Spiritual Word: Therefore ſhe is not the Church of Chriſt.

The fourth Reaſon maintained.

THat ſuch Churches as are National, do moſt encreaſe their numbers, and keep them alſo when they have them, by the terror of Death and Penal Laws, both Experience ſhews, and Reaſon tels that it cannot be otherwiſe. How often hath our Nation changed their Religion, with the breath of a Prince? ſometime to *Popery*, and otherwhiles to *Proteſtancy*, and under *O. Cromwel* to a compound of half *Presbytery* and half *Independency*, according to the temper of thoſe that ſat at the Stern of Affairs? And now, how are they turn'd again to *Prelacy*? Of which laſt change, I ſay, if any have conformed, as judging

judging it their duty to God ſo to do, thoſe (though this doth not juſtifie their way to be good, yet) are honeſt men: But if any for ſelf-intereſt have done it, they are the very dregs of men, and will be any thing, and ſo nothing.

2. I remember a notable ſaying of *Hillary*, who lived about the 4th or 5th hundred, and in his dayes the Church was a degenerating from her Regeneral Conſtitution into a National Form, where he ſaith, *Ambition doth aid it ſelf by the Name of CHRIST; the Church doth fear and compel the People through Baniſhments and Impriſonment, to believe her in thoſe things, which ſhe had received through being impriſoned— She that could not be beloved of Chriſt if the World had not hated her, now glorieth to be extolled and beloved of the World, &c.* *Hillar. contra Auxen.*

And that the Papal Church hath ordinarily encreaſed her ſelf more by terror of the Carnal Sword than the Word of God, doleful Hiſtories do declare; namely theſe, *Sleidan Comment.* A Book entituled, *The Indians Tears*, or, *Inquiſition for Blood:* as alſo, *Fox his Acts and Monuments.*

And here I think it meet to give an inſtance from one of their own Hiſtoriagraphers, namely *Fabinus.* He tells us that after *Auſtin* the Monk had gotten a conſiderable ſettlement in *England*, it happened that there was a Council aſſembled in this Nation, where *Auſtin* propoſed ſeveral things, to which the other Biſhops could not conſent; but, by your leave, when *Auſtin* could not prevail by the Word (or rather, his words) he told them, *If they would not ſubmit, they ſhould be compelled, by the waſting that ſhould be made in their Country through War and Miſery.* This was not *Paul's* way, 2 *Cor.* 5. 20.

The Fifth Reaſon.

The preſent Papal Church of *Rome*, labours to keep the World in darkneſs, and the Church alſo: Therefore ſhe is not the Church of Chriſt.

The fifth Reaſon maintained.

THe Conſequence of this Argument no man can deny; for there is nothing more oppoſit to the true Church, than to love, or cauſe darkneſs to ſeize upon any. And that the preſent Papal Church of *Rome* labours to keep all men in darkneſs, is thus proved. 1. She forbids almoſt all men to reade the Scriptures, and thereupon hath

greatly withſtood the Tranſlation of them into every Tongue, as is evident, partly from what Hiſtory declares, and partly from that which themſelves do ſay. To omit Hiſtory, hear what they ſay themſelves. In their Preface to the Reader in the *Rhemiſt Teſtament*, thus they ſpeak:

Order was taken by the Deputies of the late famous Council of Trent *in this behalf, and confirmed by ſupream Authority, That the Scripture, though truly tranſlated into the vulgar Tongues, yet may not be indifferently read of all men, nor of any other than ſuch as have expreſs Order thereunto of their lawful Ordinaries.* So that we ſee the Liberty here given, is unlike the Liberty given by Chriſt to his enemies, whom he commanded to ſearch the Scripture, *John* 5. 39. And the rich Glutton's Friends are ſaid to have the *Prophets* and *Moſes*, Luk. 16. 29. *Iſrael* was of old indifinitly required to lay up the Book of the Law in their heart; to talk of it as they ſate in their houſes; as they went abroad; they muſt teach them to their children, and write them upon the poſts of their doors, *Deut.* 6. 4, to 9.

Notwithſtanding all this and much more liberty given by the Lord both to his Enemies and Friends, to reade his Word, you ſee the *Council of Trent* will have none permitted, but whom the Ordinaries permit, to reade the Scripture, and they are only ſuch as they judge diſcreet, &c. *Pref. Rhem. Teſt.*

Is it not ſtrange that men, pretending to be Chriſt's true Followers, ſhould thus contradict him? He allowed that to his Enemies, which they will not allow to his Friends. Sure they have neither heard his Voice, nor ſeen his Shape, or, at leaſt, not learned of him. Miſerable is the Goſpel-Church by the Council of *Trents* Doctrine, they have not that priviledge which *Iſrael* under the Law was allowed; and yet they are as ſtrictly bound *to bring up their Children in the admonition of the Lord*; which they cannot do, unleſs they have the Law in their heart, that ſo they may talk of it to their Children. But ſurely, thoſe that will not let the Law come within the ſight of our eyes, have no mind it ſhould ever come in our hearts: So then they labour to keep us in the dark.

What can they ſay againſt mens reading the Scripture, which hath not the ſame force againſt the hearing of it preached? Did not ſome conceive as groſs opinions concerning Chriſt's ſaying, men muſt eat his fleſh, as ſome have by reading them? The *Jews* thought they were ſo to be underſtood, as that they might eat his *real fleſh*; and that was not a greater nor a leſſe Error, than is found in the *Papiſts*, who read the ſame word. It is doubtleſs a ſhrewd ſign that thoſe who

who will not ſuffer us to *ſee* the Law of God, do not intend that we ſhall *hear* very much of it; peradventure ſuch Points as talk of Tythes, *&c.*

Yea, it is evident, that they intend not to let us hear much that ſhall profit us; for they have deviſed, that the very Prayers and Services of their Church, be ſaid and ſung in a tongue which the People underſtand not. Yea, they tell us, *That it is enough for the People to underſtand that the Prayer is made to call upon God in all our deſires; and more than this is not neceſſary (they ſay:)* So that the poor People in the Papacy, know not what are the things deſired; only they are told, The Prayer is made to God in all that is therein deſired. Are not theſe People kept in darkneſs? But ſaith *Paul*, *How ſhould the unlearned ſay*, Amen? 1 *Cor.* 14.

That which is moſt ſtrange, is, That the Papiſts ſhould deliver this dark Doctrine, from 1 *Cor.* 14. then which no Scripture more requireth an underſtanding in thoſe that pray, and in thoſe that joyn with them; nor doth any Scripture more clearly ſhew us, to how little purpoſe it is to perform any Service in the Church in an unknown tongue. Read the Chapter; ſaith *Paul*, *If I come unto you ſpeaking with tongues, what ſhall I profit you?* —— but *in the Church I will ſpeak five words with my underſtanding, that I may inſtruct others alſo, rather than ten thouſand words in an unknown tongue.* Theſe are *Paul's* words, as the Papiſts themſelves tranſlate them.

Another way whereby they keep men in darkneſs is this, They cumber mens minds with ſuch a *MULTITUDE* of Ceremonies, and Repetitions in their Prayers, that the mind is ſufficiently charged to remember how many times over they muſt ſay ſome two or three words; nay, it's evident this is no wrong, witneſs their Beads which ſerve to ſupply the defect of their memories. As I remember, there is not leſs than fifty Orations and Poſtulations, *&c.* which the Prieſt is to make, and act, before the Bread be Conſecrated when they ſay Maſs; and the like doings they have in the moſt of their Services, which I can more deſire the Lord would deliver them from, than mention. *Willit. Synopſ.*

The

The Sixth Reaſon.

The preſent Papal Church, is generally (if not only at this day) gathered of perſons unregenerate, or not new born, as the Scriptures do require new-birth in that caſe: Therefore ſhe is not the Church of Chriſt.

The Sixth Reaſon maintained.

1. The Scripture ſaith, That *except a man* (or any one) *be born again* (SO) as to be like the winde *THAT BLOWETH*, and that bloweth in ſuch ſort, as the ſound thereof *IS HEARD*, *he cannot enter into the Kingdom* (or Church) *of God*: But the many millions of Infants, whereof the Papal Church conſiſts moſtly (if not only) in reſpect of her Members Initiation, are not thus regenerate. So that the Papal Church is gathered (generally) of ſuch Perſons as are not ſo regenerate, as Perſons oughtto be, and muſt of neceſſity be, before they be admitted into the Church of Chriſt. The Seed of the Woman (or Goſpel-Church) are all ſuch as have the Faith of Jeſus, and keep the Commandments of God, at leaſt in Profeſſion; for that is the thing that is abſolutely neceſſary, in order to any Perſon's admiſſion into the Church of Chriſt, *John* 3. 5, 6. 2 *Cor.* 5. 16, 17. *Rev.* 12. *ult.* *Gal.* 3. 26, 27, 28.

2. All the Children of the new Covenant, or Church of Chriſt, do *DIFFER* from the Church under *Moſes*, *SO*, as that they, each individual, do ſo know the Lord, as that they need not, in ſome ſort, teach *one another*, ſaying, *Know the Lord*, Heb. 8. Jer. 31. But either all, or the generality of the Papal Church, differ nothing from the Church under *Moſes*, in reſpect of their *KNOWLEDGE*, when admitted into their Church, Being ſuch as are not capable of the firſt, or leaſt degree of the knowledge of him.

3. There appears no more ſign of Regeneration, or new-Birth, in the Infants, or Members of the Papal Church, at their admiſſion, than there appears in ſuch as the Papiſts ſay are not regenerate. Now where the Spirit of regeneration is, it is not without ſome demonſtrable operation; for ſaith Chriſt, *The wind bloweth*, &c. *and thou heareſt the ſound thereof*, &c. *SO IS EVERY* One that is born of the Spirit. So that I conclude, That the Infants whom the Papiſts ſay they baptize, are not born of the Spirit, unleſs they can give ſome demonſtrative ſign of it.

4. There

4. There can be no Regeneration in an ordinary way, without preaching the Doctrine of Chriſt, *Rom.* 10. But the Papal Church is generally (if not only) gathered without the Word preached, in order to the regeneration of the Members, before their admiſſion. Therefore they are not regenerate in an ordinary way. And if they have an extraordinary regeneration, let them ſhew it.

The Seventh Reaſon.

The preſent Papal Church of *Rome*, maintaineth the Doctrine of Devils, and that ſo violently, as that they puniſh the Non-obſervation thereof with Excommunication and Death: Therefore ſhe is not the Church of Chriſt.

This Argument maintained.

THis Reaſon, or Argument, may ſeem to be harſhly laid down; yet if it be true, there is neceſſity to propound it. And for the truth of it, I deſire you weigh what followeth.

1. To forbid Marriage, and to command to abſtain from Meats which God hath created to be received, of ſuch as believe and obey the Truth; this is the doctrine of Devils. But it is well known that the Papiſts do forbid the whole Calling of their Clergy to Marry, and thouſands beſide of thoſe that live in their Monaſteries and Nunries, *&c.* and this under pain of *Curſing* and *Death*. You ſhall hear them ſpeak their own words, wherein they do not only prohibit Marriage for ever to ſuch as enter into the Miniſtry; but if any be married, and afterwards come into the Miniſtry, they wholly deprive ſuch of the enjoyment of their Yoke-fellows. Thus they ſpeak; *The cauſe why the Church requireth chaſtity in the Clergie, and forbiddeth not only fornication, but all carnal copulation, even in lawful wedlock, is to the end, that God's Prieſts be not divided from him by the clogs of Marriage, but be clean and pure from all the fleſhly acts of copulation:* And this doctrine they teach from 1 *Cor.* 7. where if you reade the 4, 5, 6, 7. *verſes*, you may eaſily learn the quite contrary Doctrine. Again, They teach from 1 *Tim.* 3.2. *That none ſhall Marry that come into holy Orders.* And, *that if any of the Clergie, in other Countries, had been permitted, in times paſt, to enjoy their Wives, yet they now declare it to be againſt the Apoſtles Rule; And this they ſay is the Sentence of the Council of* Nice. But ſurely *Paul*'s words are clear contrary; *Rhem. Teſt. Annot.* *Rhem. Teſt. Annot.*

contrary; for he ſaith, *A Biſhop muſt be the Husband of one Wife, having his Children in ſubjection*, &c.

In further proof of this matter, it is upon Record, That *Greg.7. An.* 1070. did enforce Miniſters by Excommunication, to leave their
Diſt. 32 Wives. And *Urban* 2. *Anno.* 1066. Decreed, That it might be
cap. 10. lawful to make the Miniſters Wives bond-women. And *Fox* recordeth, That it was made Felony, by the Act of the *Six Articles*, for Miniſters to marry Wives, *Fox*, *p.* 1135. And this cruelty *Bellarmine* defends by a ſaying of *Jerome*, That a Biſhop begetting Children, ſhall be condemned as an Adulterer.

Now whereas I ſay they forbid Meats, *&c.* I do not mean, that it is not meet for the Church to Faſt and Pray, and in ſuch a ſenſe to forbid meat. But for their Church to forbid one kind of meat above another; as that we may not eat Eggs in Lent, and divers other creatures which God hath created, to be received of ſuch as believe. For the true way of Faſting, is a total faſting for the time (unleſs neceſſity deny.) And truly the Papal Faſt of Lent is in a manner no Faſt, which allows the drinking of Wines, and the eating to the full of ſuch delicacies as do inflame the fleſh as much as Eggs, *&c.* which yet the Papiſts by no means will permit men to eat. For my Author tells me, That they make the eating of Eggs in Lent, a damnable ſin. *Fox*, *p.* 1043. I might fill much Paper about their forbidding meats. But to proceed:

The Eighth Reaſon.

The preſent Papal Church of *Rome*, is Myſtery Babylon: Therefore ſhe is not the Church of Chriſt.

The Eighth Reaſon maintained.

1. I Know, that generally all that diſſent from *Rome*, do account her as in her preſent ſtate to be *Myſtery Babylon*; And truly for my part, I have conſidered of this matter, and I find it is ſo clearly meant of *Rome*, that even the Papiſts do not wholly exempt her from this Name. Yet they deny that *Rome*, as now conſidered, is *Myſtery Babylon*; only, ſay they, it is to be referred to *Rome* in her *Heatheniſh* eſtate. But thus I reaſon;

2. If the preſent Papal Church of *Rome* be not *Myſtery Babylon*, then either the Papiſts, or ſome body elſe, can ſhew us a People which better deſerves that title. But this no man can do (ſo far as yet I have learned) and therefore (as yet) I muſt ſay,

The

The preſent Papal Church of *Rome* (together with her Daughter Churches) is *Myſtery Babylon*. And for further proof in this Point, I thus reaſon:

3. The preſent Papal Church hath the Marks of *Myſtery Babylon*; therefore ſhe is *Myſtery Babylon*.

I prove it thus:

One Mark of *Myſtery Babylon*, is a Regiment over the Kings of the Earth, *Rev.* 17. *The Woman which thou ſaweſt, is that great City which reigneth over the Kings of the Earth.* This Mark the preſent Papal Church of *Rome* hath above all other; Witneſs the Papiſts own Books, T. B. *End to Controv. chap.* 26, 27. where he ſets up the Pope above all Kings and Emperors; and plainly calls the Popes, Kings and Monarchs; and the Papal Church, he terms an invincible Empreſs, *&c.*

Another Mark of *Myſtery Babylon*, is great Riches and wordly Pomp. That *Rome*, in her preſent Church-ſtate, hath this Mark, her Doctor, *T. B.* is my witneſs. So is *Helen. Geog. p.* 192, 193. and *Napier*, *Rev.* 9. which Authors ſhew her Riches (even of the Clergy only) to be quite out of the reach of the beſt Arithmaticks to paſs an *Entrado* upon it. Add to all other witneſſes that of *Expeperience*, and it will ſhew us, That when their Church had her domination in this Land, they knew where the beſt Ground lay; as the Ruins of their Abbeys do evince. Compare all theſe with *Rev.* 18. and ſee if they do not agree.

Another Mark of *Myſtery Babylon* is, She ſits upon Nations, Tongues, and Peoples. *Rome* hath this Mark; *T. B.* in his *End to Controverſies*, *chap.* 26, 27.

Another Mark of *Myſtery Babylon* is, She enſlaves the Souls of men, and is drunk with blood. Now that the Papal Church of *Rome* hath this Mark, I need only to refer my Readers to thoſe large Hiſtories of *Sleidan*, *Fox*, and *Benzo* the *Italian*.

Laſtly, As I noted, it is confeſſed by the Papiſts, That *Myſtery Babylon*, *Rev.* 17. & 18. *chapters*, is meant of *Rome*; only they think to free themſelves from the force of that blow, by telling us, That it's meant of *Rome* in her *Heatheniſm*, and under the perſecuting Emperors. But this is but a poor ſhift, as may appear, by ſhewing, That the Antients do write againſt *Rome*, as *Myſtery Babylon*, after the perſecuting Emperors were down; for the Papiſts ſay, *That* Conſtatine *put an end to the Perſecution, when he was converted*, which was about the year 300, and a few odd years; at which time *Fab. Chron.*

Rhem. Test. Annot. in Rev. 17. the Papists say, *That* Rome *was given up to the Pope.* 1. *Jerome*, who lived about the fourth hundred, writing to *Eustoch.* & *Marcelus*, doth apply these words to *Rome*, viz. *Fly out of* Babylon, *let every man save his own Soul, for* Babylon *is fallen, and is become the Habitation of Devils.* Yea, he saith further, as he is quoted by the Protestants, *That* Rome *IS the* Babylonical *Harlot, according to the Revelation of St.* John, *appointed for the birth of Antichrist, which there should arise, and exercise all tyranny; and from thence should deceive the whole world with his wicked Wiles.*

Aug. de Civitat. Dei, lib. 18. And *Augustine* is most clear in this matter, in his Book of the *City of God*; where he calls *Rome* another *Babylon* in the West. And *Babylon* in the East, first *Rome*: and *Rome* of *Italy*, second *Babylon*. Willing men to consider, That in the beginning of the *City of God*, which was in *Abraham*'s time, the first *Rome*, that was, Eastern *Babylon* was builded in *Chaldea*. And about what the first *Babylon* was destroyed, lest the *City of God* should want her Enemy, the second *Babylon*, which is *Rome* in *Italy*, was erected.

Chrys. in Rev. 13. *Chrysostome* saith, *Antichrist shall invade the vacant Empire of* Rome, *and assay to draw unto himself the Empires both of God and man.* Thus it seems that *Rome* was accounted *Mystery Babylon*, four or five hundred years after Christ; and if she be not now, what she was then in that respect, I desire to be informed where that blood-drunken Fornicatrix, mentioned, *Revelation* 17. is now to be found.

The Ninth Reaſon.

The preſent Papal Church hath not thoſe Marks, which they themſelves aſſign as the Marks by which the true Church can only be known infallibly: Therefore the preſent Papal Church of *Rome*, is not the Church of Chriſt.

Thoſe Marks are;

1. *ANTIQUITY.*
2. *SUCCESSION.*
3. *UNIVERSALITY* (*of Time and Place.*
4. *VISABILITY.*
5. *SANCTITY.*
6. *UNITY.*
7. *MIRACLES*, &c.

Theſe are the Principal.

The Ninth Reaſon maintained.

THat the preſent Papal Church cannot have the true Mark of *Antiquity*, is thus evidenced; *viz.* The Papal Church is a National Church; But no Goſpel Church was National in the firſt Age: Therefore no National Church hath the true Mark of *Antiquity*.

The ſtrength of this Argument lyeth in the clear difference of the ſtate of the Church under *Abraham* and *Moſes*, to what it was under Chriſt and his Apoſtles. For,

The *Jewiſh* Church, which was to be National, took its form in a National way, even in the very firſt Family where it began, as appears, *Gen.* 17. where Parents, Children, and Servants too, muſt all be brought into that Church-ſtate forthwith, or not be ſuffered to co-habit together. Which order muſt be kept in all the Families of the *Jews*, as well in reſpect of their Servants, ſuch as they bought with money, as their Children, or any other. And ſo the *Jewiſh* Church, both in its beginning and its continuance, acted forth it ſelf in a way ſuitable to it ſelf.

Luk. 12 51, 52, 53. *Mat.* 10 34, 35. *Luke*, 21. 16. 1 *Cor.* 7. 11, 13, 15, 21, 22, 23. But when the Gospel Church began, it is very evident, that it took its beginning in the division of Families, and that by vertue of Christ's Doctrine; who affirms, That he came to send fire on the Earth; not Peace, but rather Division: For saith he, *From henceforth there shall be* five *in one house divided three against two, and two against three; the Father against the Son, and the Son against the Father; the Daughter against the Mother, and the Mother against the Daughter,* &c. *and all this for the Gospel sake.* Here a man must leave Father, Mother, Wife and Children; For this cause ye shall be betrayed, both by Parents and Kinsfolks. For this cause the unbelieving Husband will put away his believing Wife. And for this cause the Servant may refuse to follow his unbelieving Master, being Christ's freeman, and yet dwell in his Service as a Servant notwithstanding.

Thus it's evident, That the Gospel-Church took its beginning in a way quite contrary to the Form of a National Church, even by turning the World (or Church of the *Jews*) up-side-down, which caused the *Jews* to cry out, *MEN OF ISRAEL, HELP.*

Mat. 3. 9. 2 *Cor.* 5. 16, 17, 18. *Gal.* 3. 2 6, 29. *Acts* 10 35. *Rom.* 9. 6, 7, 8. This is yet more evident, by that thundring Doctrine of the *Baptist*, when he said, *Think not, or begin not to say within your selves, We have* Abraham *to our Father.* No, saith *Paul*, *We* (meaning the Gospel-Church) *which are of Faith, are the Seed of* Abraham, *and Heirs according to Promise*; For the Promise (which chiefly) is enjoyed in the Gospel, was not made to such as were born after the Flesh, but such as are born after the Spirit; Whereupon he saith, We henceforth know No man after the Flesh [or because he descends from the loins of *Abraham*, or any other.] For if any man be in Christ (so as to be a demonstrable or visible Member of his Gospel-Church) he is a new-creature. Old things are passed away, [yea, the old priviledge of standing in the Church by the Father's interest, though the Seed of *Abraham* himself] is [now] passed, behold all things [in this respect] are become new. Whereupon *Peter* contributeth his sentence, and saith, *Of a truth I perceive God is no respecter of Persons*, [*but* the Persons accepted upon a Gospel-account, so as to be his Church, are such as *in every Nation fear him, and work Righteousness* [which no *Infant* can do.] But what? Hath God rejected *Infants* wholly, that now he will not shew them so much favour as afore-time? God forbid. He hath not shut up his tender Mercies from them wholly, or in part; For as they are such, and

dying

dying in their infancy through *Adam*'s transgression, so in Christ shall they be made alive. Wherefore look how far soever they fall in the first man of the Earth, so far they shall be restored by the Lord from Heaven; yea, the Gift to them by Christ shall exceed the Loss they had by *Adam*. But if they live to years of understanding, and become actual sinners against God, then the way appointed for the remission of their sins, is, *to repent, and be baptized, every one of them, that they may receive the holy Ghost*, and so be by it led *into all Truth*; *and attain at the end the salvation of their souls, through Jesus Christ our Lord.* *Rom.* 5. 16, 18. *Acts* 2. 38, *to* 41.

Another Argument whereby it appears the Church of Christ cannot be National, is this; No man is bound to become a Christian under pain of corporal punishment, as Death, &c. but living peaceably as men, no man hath power to compel them to be baptized, or to walk in the Christian Profession, as is clear from the Texts before recited. Now take away Force in matters of Religion, and a National Church cannot stand in an absolute National Form; this all experience can testifie.

Again, That the Church of Christ at the first, or in the first Ages was not National (in the first method or way wherein a Church beginneth to be so, namely, by the admission of Infants into the Church) is very evident; because it is utterly incredible, that the many thousands of Infants, of such as in those dayes believed, should be admitted into the Church, and not so much as the whisper of such a thing to be found in all the holy Writings of the Apostles. And beside, I have shewed from the Testimony of *Vives*, (*Augustines* Commentor) That the Church had not the custom to baptize Infants in old time.

It is likewise certain (if History be true) That the Gospel-Church used no compulsion in matters of Faith for more than three hundred years after Christ. About which time *Constantine* ordained grievous punishments for such as spake against Christ; and allowed the *Christians*, to use the Unbelievers hardly. But God did not bless these doings: for *Constantine* became an *Arrian* Heretick, and persecuted the Bishop that baptized him, as also others that continued faithful. *Fab. Chron. 4th part. Yet this* Eusebius *doth seem to contradict.*

Hence then I conclude, That seeing the present Papal Church of *Rome* hath not the true Mark of Antiquity, Therefore they lose at once, the next three, *Succession*, *Universality*, and *Visibility*: For,

Antiquity

Antiquity being wanting, no true Succeſſion can be found; becauſe the Root of Succeſſion, if good, muſt be the Antiquity of it. So take Antiquity from them, and then wanting that firſt Age, they cannot be found in every Age; and not being found in every Age, eſpecially the firſt Age, then they loſe *Viſibility*, as themſelves propoſe it for a Mark of the Church. And for their *Holineſs*, I have ſpoken to that before, and ſurely it is but like their neighbours. And for their *Miracles*, I have given you a taſte of them from *Loreto*: and beſide, others do claim that mark as well as they; Yea, the *Turks* produce Miracles; and the *Proteſtants* do the like; and others, as the *Quakers*, the like: and the *Baptiſts* can ſay of a truth, that God hath done for and amongſt them, ſome things which have exceeded the courſe of Nature. And ſo their Miracles will not more prove them a Church, than the Miracles of others will prove the contrary, unleſs they can prove the others to be Illuſions.

Willit. Synopſ. Papiſ.

And that they have not the mark of *Unity*, is evident, if Hiſtory may be heeded; for, ſaith my Author, there is an hundred Sects of Monks and Fryars amongſt them, and ſome of them ſo divided, as they burnt one another for matters of Religion. And for different Opinions, there are no leſs than three hundred. See *Fox Act. and Monument. p.* 260. and *Willit*, in his Book called, *Tetraſtiton Papiſ.*

I know the *Papiſts* do make a great deal of noiſe about their *Paſtoral Succeſſion*, as if they could derive it from man to man, up to the Apoſtle *Peter*. But I find the learned *Proteſtants* making it a great Queſtion, whether ever *Peter* was Biſhop of *Rome*, or not. And *Ferom* is ſaid to have ſeen ſome old Books, which ſhew, that *Narciſſus* ruled the *Roman Church*, when *Paul* ſaluted him and his Family, in his Epiſtle to the *Romans*.

Jerome, in ep. ad Rom.

No ſmall contention is there likewiſe among the Learned, Whether *Linus* or *Clement* were the ſecond Biſhop of *Rome*: So that this Paſtoral Succeſſion the Papiſts pretend to, meets with ſhrewd Objections in the very firſt and ſecond perſon of that Line.

Againſt the uninterrupted continuance of their pretended *Succeſſion*, many things are objected: as, That there were ſometimes *three*, and ſometimes *two* Popes, and that for more than twenty years time together; ſo that no man could tell where the true Paſtoral Authority lay. And then comes in that ſtrange diſaſter of *Joan* the female Pope, who for almoſt three years cut the chain of this pretended Succeſſion. This thing is famous in Hiſtory.

Laſtly,

Lastly, Although the *Papists* could prove a continued Succession of persons claiming the Title of *Universal Bishop*, yet this would not justifie them all to be the Pastors of Christ's Church. For these two Rules are given us even by the Antients; 1. That *Peter* left his Innocency hereditary as well as his Seat; and that he which hath not the one as well as the other, is not *Peter's Successor*. 2. That it is not the *Chair*, but the *Doctrine* that maketh a Bishop. Now, 3dly, add but *Paul's* Rule in this matter, 1 *Tim.* 3. and *Titus* 1. and then I am bold to affirm, That many Popes of *Rome* were not the true Successors of *Peter* in Pastoral Authority. For I find it laid to the charge of divers Popes, that they were Drunken-Whoremongers, Theeves, given more to War than Christ, rooted in all unspeakable sin; furious men, prophane Scoffers of Christ; Incestuous persons, Murderers, Poysoners of their own Parents and Kindred; open Sodomites or Buggerers; Blasphemers, incorrigible Hereticks, Enchanters; callers upon the Devil to help them to play at Dice; Drinkers of the Devil's Health, and Traitors to Princes. These things are so notorious and evidently true of the Popes of *Rome*, as that the Papists do not deny them. T. B. *End to Controvers.* and the Author of the *Seven Queries*, as you may see in part before. Yea, *Bernard* was not a little moved with the wickedness of the Popes of *Rome*, when he called them, *Tyrants*, *Defrauders*, *Raveners*, *Traytors*, *Darkness of the World*, *Wolves* and *Devils*. And, can we think that Succession to be good which is derived from Devils? I need say no more. See, for the proof of all that I have said, these Books; *Fox Act.* & *Monument.*, *Willet Synops.* *Prediaux Introduct.*

The Tenth Reason.

The present Assemblies of Baptized Believers, and they only, are the true visible Church of Jesus Christ: Therefore the present Papal Church of *Rome*, is not the Church of Christ.

The Explanation of this Reason, or Argument.

THis Reason or Argument is not so to be understood, as if we do shut all men out of Heaven who are not Members of our Church. No verily: This is the express Doctrine of the Papists: for they say, *that out of the Church is no Salvation*; and by Church they mean, only those that adhere to the *Papal Church* of *Rome*: and hereupon they teach expresly (and so do some Protestants also) *That without Baptism, or the desire of Baptism, &c. none can be saved*: And therefore it is that they give power to Midwives to baptize Children sometimes between the Womb and the World.

That which we teach, is this, That the ordinary way appointed
Luk.24 for men to receive Salvation in, is, *The preaching of Repentance and Remission of sins to all Nations, in the Name of Jesus Christ; and the administration of Baptism, as a pledge thereof, to all that give acceptance to these Glad-tydings*; and upon this account this Ministration is called, *The Baptism of Repentance for the remission of sins.* And we do teach, as a most infallible Doctrine, *That without profession of Faith, manifestation of Repentance, and being baptized with Water in the Name of Jesus Christ, &c. no person can be orderly admitted into the Church or Kingdom of God on Earth.* And that therefore it concerns every man, living to years of understanding, and having the Gospel tendred to him, only to look for Salvation this way, as he will answer it before the Lord, for contemning God's ordinary way, and presuming to challenge the Grace of Eternal Life in a way of his own devising.

Nevertheless, we do not hence conclude, That all persons shall be damned that seek not Life in this way. For, first, No Infant can seek for it in the way which the Gospel proposeth Life to men of years: Yet surely it is a most cruel Doctrine to say, that any Infants dying in their infancy shall be damned in Hell, because (as one

one very well ſaid) God will not damn any perſons for that which they cannot help.

Again, in *Rom.* 1ſt. and 2d. chapters, *Paul* teacheth, That if the ſons of men act forth themſelves in a way of Love, Fear, Obedience, and Reverence to their Creator, according to the means of Light vouchſafed to them, that this ſhall be as much as ſhall be required of them, in the day when God ſhall judge the ſecrets of all men by Jeſus Chriſt (for God will not gather where he hath not ſtrewed) at which time, God will not judge them by the Law that never had it. Howbeit, let all that have it (I mean his written Law) expect to be judged by it. And therefore, though we will not preſume to judge of the final ſtate of this or that Society of men profeſſing conſcionably this or that Form of Worſhip, but leave that wholly to the Lord; yet we will not ceaſe humbly to beg of all ſuch perſons in the Name of Jeſus Chriſt, that they having his Law, would carefully obſerve the terms whereupon Life is held forth unto them, and become ſuch glad receivers of the Word, as is mentioned, *Acts* 2. 41. *Then they which gladly received the Word, were baptized: and the ſame day were added to the Church about three thouſand ſouls:* The Argument thus explained, I ſhall now endeavour to make it good.

The Tenth Argument maintained.

That the preſent Aſſemblies of Baptized Believers, and no other preſent Aſſemblies of men, are the true Church of Chriſt, I prove, thus: Either the preſent Aſſemblies of Baptized Believers, or elſe ſome other Aſſemblies now in the practice of Infant * Baptiſm, muſt be the true Church of Chriſt; becauſe without Baptiſm, the Papiſts ſay (and ſay truly too) there can be no true Church of Chriſt at this day: Now theſe two wayes of Baptizing only (I mean of Water-Baptiſm) is pretended as neceſſary in order to a viſible Church-ſtate: *viz.* the dipping or baptizing perſons upon their perſonal profeſſion of Faith, as the preſent Aſſemblies of the *Baptiſts* do practiſe; or baptizing (or rather ſprinkling) of Infants without perſonal profeſſion of Faith, as the preſent National Churches do practiſe.

* *Alias, Rantiſm*

For moſt undoubtedly, the true and legitimate claim to this Title of *Chriſt's Church*, muſt be found in one of theſe two Parties: And that no National Aſſembly, gathered together by Pedo-baptiſm, can fairly claim this Title, I have ſhewed before, whither now I refer my Reader. And for the evincing yet further, that the preſent Aſ-

ſemblies of Baptized Believers are the true viſible Church of Chriſt, I thus argue:

They, and they only, have the true Eccleſiaſtical Marks of truly Antient Primitive or Apoſtolical Gathering, Conſtitution and Government: Therefore they, and they only, are the true Church of Jeſus Chriſt.

Theſe three points, namely, *Gathering*, *Conſtitution* and *Government*, I take (if right) to be the infallible Marks of a true Church. And that the preſent Aſſemblies of Baptized Believers, and they only, have them, will be evident to him that conſidereth what they were at firſt, and how they agree with what in theſe reſpects is only found in the Aſſemblies of the Baptized Congregations.

The truly Antient, Primitive and Apoſtolical Gathering, in reſpect of the firſt means uſed in order thereunto, was the preaching Repentance and Remiſſion of ſins, or the Goſpel *unto every Creature*; and upon their conviction, to command them, as from the Lord, to be baptized, *every one of them*, in the Name, &c. as appears, *Matth.* 28. 19, 20. *Mark* 16. 15, 16. *Acts* 2. 38. *Acts* 8. 37. *Acts* 10. 47, 48. And herein onely the preſent Aſſemblies of Baptized Believers do cloſely follow Chriſt's Primitive Miniſters.

The Primative and Apoſtolical Gathering of the Church of Chriſt in reſpect of the ſubjects gathered, were only ſuch, as through the virtue and prevalency of the Word preached, or made known, did give a demonſtration of their Regeneration by the profeſſion of Faith, and manifeſtation of Repentance, and being dipped in Water in the Name of the Father, *&c.* For the proof whereof I appeal to thoſe ſeveral Scriptures alledged againſt the gathering of Chriſt's Church of ſuch perſons, as of whoſe Regeneration no demonſtration is or can be given, anſwerable to what the Scripture doth require, in order to perſons admiſſion into the Kingdom of God or Church on Earth. And, ſecondly, I appeal to the practice of the Apoſtles acting, in purſuance of that Commiſſion given them in that behalf. And, thirdly, I do appeal to the Churches themſelves, which were gathered by the Apoſtles, as they are deſcribed to us in theſe ſeveral Texts following.

Theſe Texts do ſhew to the diligent Reader, that here is ſuch things ſpoken of this numerous Church, as is neceſſarily excluſive of any Infants being admitted into their Society, as to participate of any Church Ordinance: And the like will appear to the Scripture-ſearching Soul, in all thoſe other Churches; as the reſpective places will ſufficiently convince.

I have it freely granted, under the hand of a learned Clergyman, That Churches, *at the firſt*, were gathered only as we affirm: but he tells me, That when Perſecution ceaſed, God took in all Nations, or whole Nations; which hitherto he hath not proved.

The Church at *Jeruſalem.* { *Acts* 1. 15, 21, 22. *Acts* 2. 41, 42. *Heb.* 5, 6, & 8, *Chapters.*

The Church at *Samaria.* { *Acts* 8. 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17.

The Church at *Ceſaria.* { *Acts* 10. 33, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48.

The Church at *Antioch.* { *Acts* 11. 20, 21, 23, 26. *Acts* 13. 12. with *Acts* 9. 38.

The Church at *Philippi.* { *Acts* 16. 12, 13, 14, 15, 31, 32, 33, 34, 40. *Phil.* 1. 6, 7, 8, 9, 10.

The Church at *Theſſalonica.* { *Acts* 17. 1, 2, 3, 4. 2 *Theſſ.* 1. 3, 10, 11.

The Church at *Coloſſe.* { *Coloſſ.* 1. 4, 5, 6. *Coloſſ.* 2. 10, 11, 12.

The Church at *Corinth.* { *Acts* 8. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8. 1 *Cor.* 1. 2.

The Church at *Rome.* { *Acts* 28. 24. *Rom.* 6. 3, 14.

The Church at *Epheſus.* { *Acts* 19. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7. *Epheſ.* 1. 13, 14, 15.

The Church at *Galatia.* { *Gal.* 3. 26, 27, 28, 29. *Gal.* 3. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6.

These Scriptures, duely considered, shew, That all those famous Churches, were gathered in a way contrary to that of the National Churches, and consonant to the way of the present Baptized Churches. And be it here observed, that no man ever yet could shew by any Record of such Authority as may suffice to be a Foundation of Faith in this case, that by the Apostles any were ever admitted into the Church in their infancy. Wherefore look well upon the Scripture, and then upon the gathering of the Churches of the *Baptists*, and you will find that they, and they only, have the true Antient Primitive or Apostolical-mark of Church-gathering.

Of CONSTITUTION.

THey onely can be truly constituted that are rightly gathered, which the Baptized Churches onely are. The Primitive Constitution of the Church consisted principally in these two heads; *viz.* Free-fellowship in the Doctrine of the Apostles; *Acts* 2. 40, 41, 42, 47. *Joh.* 1. 11, 12, 13. *Act.* 17. 4. 1 *Thess.* 1. 5, 6, 9. 1 *John* 1. 3. *Rev.* 22. 17.

No force of a worldly nature was used in the begetting or continuing her Fellowship, for it was a mutual consent.

The second thing pertaining to the Constitution, consists in the disposing of her Members to those places to which they are fitted to serve in the body, 1 *Cor.* 12. 27. with vers. 18. 28. *Acts* 6. 3, 4.

Now that the present Assemblies of the Baptized Believers, have this form of Constitution in both respects, is evident to all that will take knowledge of their Constitution.

Of GOVERNMENT.

THe true Ancient Primitive and Apostolical Government of the Church, was only Spiritual, and did recide not in the Pastors apart from the Church, but in the Pastors together with the Church; yet so, as that those to whom the Church hath committed her Power, are the Instruments, that in the Name of Christ and his Church, are to exercise Government, *Matth.* 18. 17, 18. 1 *Cor.* 5. 3, 4, 5. 1 *Tim.* 1. 20. & 5. 20.

This Government consisteth in these things; Exhortations, Rebukes, Reproofs, *&c.* with all long-Suffering and Doctrine,

2 *Tim.*

2 *Tim.* 1. 2. And if this prevail not with the Offenders, then is the power of Excommunication to be exerciſed, to the with-holding their Priviledges in the Church, and to the delivering them up to Satan for the deſtruction of the Fleſh; and for ſaving the ſinner from his ſin. And if this prevail not, then the ſinners ſin is retained, till the day of Judgment. But if the ſinner be humbled, the ſin is by the Church to be remitted, and the Offender reſtored, *Matth.* 18. 17, 18. 1 *Cor.* 5. 3, 4, 5, 11, 13. 2 *Theſſ.* 3. 6, 14, 15. *Tit.* 3. 11. *Joh.* 20. 23.

And this Government is to be exerciſed without partiality, 1 *Tim.* 5. 21. and without reſpect to filthy lucre, 1 *Pet.* 5. 2. and without domination or lordſhip, 2 *Cor.* 1. 24. 1 *Pet.* 5. 1, 2, 3, 4. 1 *Theſſ.* 5. 6, 7, 8.

Now that this Goverment is only found in the preſent Aſſemblies of Baptized Believers, is thus proved; *Out* of the Church it cannot be, and *in* the Church it muſt be, *Epheſ.* 4. till all the Saints be perfected; and that this Society, and no other, can be the Church, I have alſo proved; and for further evidence I refer every one to the exerciſe of the preſent Churches of baptized Believers, in point of Eccleſiaſtical Government.

As for other Marks, it is needleſs to inſiſt upon them; for that Church which hath *theſe*, cannot be without the *other*, ſo far as they are neceſſary. Yea, let it be well obſerved, That that Church which hath true *Antiquity*, is the Church alone, which hath the Promiſe of Succeſſion, or whatſoever elſe is needful in a way of neceſſity in order to her being: And therefore, though we could not prove by Hiſtory, thoſe things which many make great boaſt of; yet, having the moſt certain Mark [*Antiquity*] we have the other in Promiſe, and therefore muſt believe that the Church hath not failed of the accompliſhment of them; for Hiſtories (ſome of them) be quite loſt; and others, partly ſilent, and partly contradictory about theſe things. Again, if Hiſtory did mention an un-interrupted continuance of Baptized Churches, ſuch, I mean, as we contend for, yet it would be but *Teſtis humano*, and ſo no foundation of Faith: And beſide, it would ſuppoſe, that the Church of Chriſt is ſo beholding to humane Hiſtory, as it's impoſſible for her to prove her ſelf the Church of Chriſt without it, though ſhe have the holy Scripture. But this is ſurely to make the Church to ſtand upon too ſandy a foundation.

THE END.

The Printer to the Reader.

Courteous Reader.

THe Author being at a great diſtance, ſo that he could not attend the Preſs, this Treatiſe was haſtily read over by a Friend of his, who having obſerved theſe few faults, deſires thee to correct them with thy Pen, as alſo any other which thou ſhalt meet with, that probably he hath overſeen.

Page 16. line 19. for *will allow*, reade, *will not allow*. P. 20. l. 23. f. *theſe following*, r. *in theſe things following*. P. 31. l. 22. f. *they advance*, r. *they might advance*.